

ST. DOMINGO.

[Compiled, chiefly, from recent publications.]

It is not doubted that the misrepresentations that the enemies of freedom have so industriously circulated, relative to the disturbances on this island, keep a great many honest men from joining the anti-slavery cause. It has been said by them, so many times, that "immediate emancipation" in St. Domingo was attended with the most horrid massacres on the part of the blacks, that many persons recoil from the doctrine of *immediateism*, who might otherwise prove themselves to be the practical friends of liberty in the United States.

We propose, therefore, to give in these pages a statement of facts from a highly respectable work, by which it will be seen, in the language of the author, that "the commotions in Hayti may be principally attributed to the impolicy and injustice of the planters and colonists themselves; that the slave population, in endeavoring to recover their freedom, were guilty of no greater cruelties than those exercised towards them by their oppressors; and thus will be obviated the erroneous opinion which ascribes exclusively to the negroes, those deeds of bloodshed and destruction that marked the contest."

The author of the work from which we extract is W. W. HARVEY, Esq., Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, England. Mr. H. resided some time in Hayti. At the beginning of his book, (which was published in 1827) he is at the pains to inform his readers that he was then opposed to the doctrine of immediate emancipation. This, it will be remembered, was before the experiment had been tried with such remarkable and gratifying success in Bermuda and Antigua. The testimony of such a witness to the safety of emancipation in St. Domingo, must convince even prejudice and passion.—ED.

EFFECTS OF IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION IN ST. DOMINGO.

The effects produced on the negroes by the contentions among the French residents, the proceedings of the mulattoes, and the exertions of the Amis des Noirs, were such as might have been easily foreseen. * * * Nothing was more natural than their determination to escape from the yoke under which they groaned, and to assert their right to liberty and independence. * * * *

The negroes had risen, bent on obtaining their freedom, and the mulattoes on securing their privileges;—these were crimes, in the estimation of the colonists, never to be forgiven. Slavery or destruction was the demand of the planters;

liberty or death, the determination of the insurgents.

The disregard of the former to all their claims, the repeated refusal to grant them redress, or to allow their condition to be in any degree ameliorated, with the violence of the measures pursued in order to subdue them, served only to render them more desperate and formidable. Neither their scanty resources on the one hand, nor the strong opposition which they met with on the other, could shake their resolution, or diminish their thirst for revenge. But animated by their numbers, and growing increasingly fierce by their ravages, an occasional defeat caused only a momentary check before the flame broke forth in all its fury.

Then it was that St. Domingo became the scene of the most dreadful ravages, and of massacres as horrid as the world has ever witnessed.

The revolvers, it should be remembered, did not engage in this work of destruction because their liberty was granted, but because it was denied them. They did not murder the whites because the latter showed a disposition to lessen their toils and sufferings, and to render their condition less grievous and degrading; or because they held out to them the prospect of emancipation at a future period; but because they evinced a determination to retain them in a state of slavery, and to subject them to all its miseries.

While these commotions were at their height, the English, then at war with France, invaded St. Domingo. The French had now two enemies to oppose; the regular and well disciplined troops of the British army, and the revolted negroes. After several ineffectual attempts to withstand the former, the French commissioners, to whom the government of the island had been intrusted, issued a proclamation of freedom, with a view to ensure the assistance of all the negroes. This, at the moment, was considered a dangerous experiment. It was without parallel in the history of slavery; and its effects on the negroes, under existing circumstances, could not be determined with any degree of certainty. No longer in subjection to the laws of a degrading servitude, and collected together in one body, they might easily have fallen on those who, till this time, had shown themselves their greatest oppressors. But the revolters, as well as the other negroes, instantly joined the French forces, and united with them in endeavoring to expel what they considered a common foe. For the invaders, they concluded came not to assist them in maintaining their rights, but to drive out the French, to claim the colony, and to endeavor, at least, to re-establish and perpetuate the system which was at this moment abolished.

During the ensuing contest, the French had no reason to lament the important step they had taken. Its history furnishes the most satisfac-

tory proofs, that to the exertions of the negroes, they were principally* indebted for the expulsion of the English, and their continued possession of the island: that, in short, had they been destitute of negro soldiers, they would have thought themselves fortunate in escaping with their lives, leaving their foes in quiet possession of their richest and most important colony. Many of their bravest and most skilful leaders were selected from among them. The distinguished talents of *Toussaint L'Ouverture*, and the importance of his active and persevering efforts are well known, and have been duly appreciated. The zeal and bravery of *Christophe* placed him next in rank and influence to *Toussaint*.

Both were negroes, and had been slaves, but now employed their talents, and risked their lives, in defending their late masters, with the utmost ardor and fidelity.

The struggle was long and doubtful; and the sufferings of both parties, from the loss of men, want of provisions, and the diseases incidental to the climate, were severe. The negroes endured their portion; and that, it should be remembered, for the men by whom they had been enslaved, and in order that *they†* might

* The writer might have said, altogether.—ED.

† Mr. Harvey here refers to the French nation, and not to the whites of St. Domingo. Towards the royalist pro-slavery party who had called in the British

retain the possession and government of the island. Nor should it be forgotten, that the French were not in circumstances to command the assistance of the negroes; especially that of those who had become open revoltors.—They might have refused it without danger to themselves, and have abandoned the French to their fate. But throughout the contest, there was nothing that indicated a disposition to avenge themselves of their former sufferings; nothing that occurred among them contrary to the firmest attachment to the cause of their late masters, and a zealous perseverance in opposing the enemy. * * * *

These were circumstances in which the negroes had never before been placed; and their character was, therefore, to undergo a further trial. Having one of their own race at the head of affairs, trained by long service to military exercises, in possession of the instruments of war, and having nothing to oppose them but

for the very purpose of reducing the negroes to the old yoke, they were of course hostile. The aim of Toussaint, in driving out the British, was to preserve the colony to France, now revolutionized, under which he undoubtedly aspired to the chief command. The point to be looked at is, that throughout this war, the negroes, with a vast majority of the power, both physical and intellectual, in their hands, paid the most sacred regard to the rights, property, and interests of all those whites who took the side of the Commissioners of the French National Convention. These whites had nearly all been slave masters.—Ed.

the broken remains of the French forces; how easily might they have shaken off all connexion with the mother country, have asserted their complete independence, and destroyed those who should oppose them! There was no obstacle to their avenging themselves on their former oppressors, either by expelling them from the island, or by cutting them off; nor to their abandoning the plantations to the ruin which the late war, with the preceding ravages had already commenced.

These considerations readily presented themselves to the minds of the remaining planters; nor could they help entertaining a serious concern for their own safety, and for the peace and tranquillity of the colony. But the event showed, that their fears were altogether destitute of foundation. The administration of Toussaint, for its ability, mildness, and integrity, they acknowledged was beyond all praise. Considering the interests of France alone, the colony had never been in a more prosperous condition. The negroes gave every proof of industry, subordination, and content. They diligently cultivated the plantations, and received the wages of their labor. They submitted cheerfully to all those regulations which it was thought necessary to establish; and living in possession of their freedom, were satisfied and happy. Those whose merits had raised them to stations of honor and responsibility, were as solicitous for the

re-establishment of the French interests as for the preservation & their own freedom. In short, the colony had seldom been more productive, the revenue which it afforded to the mother country more abundant, the persons and property of the planter more secure, nor the negroes themselves more industrious and peaceful. In this manner things would have no doubt proceeded—the natives improving in the arts of peace and civilization—the produce of the island yielding increased wealth both to the proprietors and to the cultivators—till the distinctions of color and the prejudices founded on them would have been forgotten—and the whole state of things have presented a proof that whites and blacks may, in all respects, become equals, and regard each other as brethren—had not the restless ambition of the usurper of France, and the discontent of the ex-colonists, disturbed the tranquillity of the island, and suddenly renewed those contests, which, it was hoped, had for ever ceased.

During the short interval of peace between England and France in 1802, an expedition was fitted out by the government of the latter country, and sent to St. DOMINGO. Its professed design was to subdue those in the colony who, they would have it thought, were inimical to the authority of the mother country; its real object was to reduce the negroes to slavery a second time. For this purpose an army, whose valor had been previously tried in Europe, was trans-

ported across the Atlantic, under the command of one of their most popular generals. [Le Clerc.] It was further intended that the negroes should be scattered over different parts of the colony, so as to prevent their collecting together in large bodies; and other arrangements having been made, slavery was to be again proclaimed. Than the injustice of this attempt nothing can be more glaring. Independent of the natural right of the negroes to liberty, their freedom had been declared by the French commissioners, and recognised and confirmed by the French government. That government now attempted to enslave them again. Could it be for a moment expected that they would stand still, and allow these designs to be carried into execution, without making any resistance? They had felt the rigors of slavery, and had endured them too long to allow them ever to be forgotten. They were now in possession of their freedom, and were not to be suddenly deprived of it without making one effort in its defence.

Happily for the cause of liberty, before the French could make the necessary arrangement, the negro leaders, who from the first suspected their designs, discovered the real object of the expedition. Enraged at the injustice of those in whose honor they had hitherto placed the utmost confidence, they instantly flew to arms; and the negro soldiers with the cultivators were once more compelled to unite in defending their

rights, against the designs of men who had acknowledged their freedom, and solemnly sworn to be its protectors. The French finding that nothing could be effected by stratagem, and that the plans on which they had confidently relied for success were defeated; now determined to subdue and enslave the objects of their oppression by force of arms; feeling assured that the negroes, though their superiors in number, could not long withstand the skill and bravery of their own troops.

Disappointed in this expectation also, and regarding the blacks as a species of brutes, they had immediate recourse to such methods of cruelty and death, as would be selected only for the purpose of exterminating a dangerous and destructive race of animals; to barbarities worse than had ever before stained the annals of any people pretending to the character of civilization. All the male negroes and mulattoes they could lay their hands on, were murdered in the most shocking manner. Five hundred of these unfortunate beings were at one time shot near Cape François; and an equal number were, on another occasion, coolly massacred in view of the negro army. Thousands were carried on board the vessels in the harbor, and were either suffocated in the holds, or thrown overboard in chains and drowned. Even these methods failed to accomplish the horrid purposes of these blood-thirsty tyrants—till at length they had

recourse to the dreadful expedient of hunting and destroying the unhappy victims of their rage by blood-hounds.—These animals, pursuing the negroes to the parts of the mountains inaccessible to their no less bloody employers, easily gained their retreats, and devoured all who were so unfortunate as to be discovered. Such of the black prisoners as had evinced the greatest zeal and activity in defence of liberty, were selected from the rest; and on Sundays were dragged to a spot chosen for the purpose, and in sight of thousands of spectators, were thrown to those terrible animals and torn to pieces. In short, the attempt was founded in injustice, commenced by treachery, and conducted in a manner the most inhuman and barbarous.

To the arms, the treachery, and the cruelty of the French, what had the negroes to oppose? By what means were a body of men, in a great measure ignorant of all that was necessary to a successful enterprise, trained in the school of slavery, and knowing little except its rigors, frequently destitute of a sufficient number of leaders, and but ill-furnished with arms, to contend successfully with troops trained to every mode of warfare, and stimulated by a resolution to subduc, or to exterminate.

But however hopeless their case for some time appeared, they determined on resistance as long as there should be any left capable of opposing

their enemies. They first united in one body and entered into a common vow, either to expel their oppressors, or to die in the attempt. "La Liberté où la mort" was their rallying cry; and though there appeared little or no prospect of success, they ever felt animated by the conviction, that they fought in the best of causes—the cause of freedom and independence. Right and justice were on their side; they felt it so, and it rendered them unconquerable. In the early part of the contest, they were deprived by treachery of their ablest leader; but his loss served only to increase their rage, and consequently to render them more formidable. During this severe struggle, they displayed a degree of courage and firmness, with a patient endurance of privations and sufferings, far above their condition and character. At the same time they sought and found opportunities of revenge; and the cruelties which they perpetrated were equal in number and atrocity,* to those committed by their oppressors. But it will be remembered that they were, in the first instance, compelled to take up arms in their defence, by the unjust designs of the French; and were then urged by their subsequent barbarities, to avail them of every occasion and mode of retaliation. They fought for liberty; and if they found that the only way to secure it was through blood, it was

* If equal in number, certainly not in atrocity.—Ed.

an alternative to which their enemies had reduced them. Nor will those who have paid attention to the circumstances of the war hesitate to consider the French as chiefly chargeable with the horrors, cruelties, and massacres of this sanguinary contest.

After a doubtful and desperate struggle, success crowned the exertions of the Haytians.—They expelled their foes, secured their rights, and took possession of the island, which their toils and sufferings had purchased.—*Harvey.*

Our readers are now competent to judge for themselves, whether the colored inhabitants of this island are capable of self-support and self-government. Will they not feel ashamed of their own nation, when they reflect that it has refused to recognise the independence of Hayti, or to hold any diplomatic intercourse with this interesting people, while at the same time our statesmen and orators have been perpetually declaiming in favor of the liberty of the Poles, the Greeks, the South Americans, and the Texans! The Haytians may say, "I am black, but comely; look not upon me, because I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me: my mother's children were angry with me." Solomon's Song, i, 5, 6. "The white man has no pre-eminence by nature, above the black . . . All original difference between men, so far as the

constitution of their nature is concerned, are the result of accidental causes, of climate, of soil, of local peculiarities."—*Professor Stuart.*

PRESENT CONDITION OF ST. DOMINGO.

IN 1831, was published in London, the journal of a traveller in Hayti. See Jay's Inquiry, page 178. "Being aware," he says, "that this city (*Port au Prince*) had very recently suffered greatly by fire, I expected to see an unsightly waste of ruins and decay; but the lots are rebuilt, and many a splendid and substantial edifice, surpassing those to be seen in the city of Kingston, in Jamaica, has arisen as the first fruits of the security which property enjoys by the recognised independence of Hayti."

The traveller states that he made an excursion just out of the town to the little cottage settlements on the side of the mountain above the city. When the island was under the control of the whites, this neighborhood was comparatively neglected, and never cultivated as it is now. "At present they are covered with a thousand small settlements, appropriated to coffee, provisions, fruit, and vegetables."

Port au Prince is at this day, in style, and and one may say splendor, far superior to what it was in the colonial period of its history. The

Journal speaks of the scene presented to the view of the traveller, who quits the city to journey on the highway to the mountains. "On the road he meets a multitude of cultivators coming to the city market, with horses and asses loaded with provisions. He will see wagons with produce drawn by hardy and healthy cattle. If he departs from the high road, and turns to the right hand, through one of the woodland paths, he will find himself entering into open grounds, covered with verdant fields; he will see traces everywhere visible of renewed cultivation; mansions *re-erected*; aqueducts *reconducting* their streams to irrigate the land; the sound of water-mills at work; cottages no longer deserted, but tenanted by laborers once more issuing from them, to gather in the harvest of the treading soil."

"The island of Jamaica does not exhibit a plantation better established than Chateau Blond; whether we consider the resources of the land, or the *mechanical* economy by which these resources are commanded, it is a splendid establishment."

"To me, who have had an opportunity from the day of my birth, and *long residence in a slave colony*, of forming by comparison a correct estimate of this people's advancement, the general quiet conduct and respectful behaviour of all classes here, publicly and privately, is a matter exciting great surprise."

Vice Admiral Fleming stated, before the committee of the British Parliament, that "the Haytians appeared to him the happiest, best fed, and most comfortable negroes he had ever seen: better off even than in the Caraceas: infinitely better than in Jamaica; there was no comparison between them. . . . They now feed themselves, and *they export provisions*, which neither the French nor the Spaniards had ever done before."

Admiral Fleming stated that he rode about very much, and saw no marks of destitution any where; the country seemed improving, and trade increasing. There was a better police in Hayti, than in the new South American states; the roads much better; a regular post established; the government one quite worthy of a civilized people; the negroes all working in the fields.

Mr. Jeremie, late first president of the royal court of St. Lucia, informs us, that in St. Domingo "is found a *happy, flourishing, and contented peasantry*, engaged in the cultivation of their own small freeholds; and as these persons acquire capital, they form larger establishments, and are gradually rising. This proves that the general wants of the community are supplied, and, if well governed, that community must soon acquire strength, and rise to importance." *Essays on Colonial Slavery*, 1832, p. 63.

The amount of the following articles, im-

ported in 1832, was estimated, says Mr. Jeremie, as follows, viz.:

Coffee, . . .	50,000,000 <i>lbs.</i>
Cotton, . . .	1,500,000 "
Tobacco, . . .	500,000 "
Cocoa, . . .	500,000 "
Dye Wood, . . .	5,000,000 "
Tortoise Shell, . . .	12,000 "
Mahogany, . . .	6,000,000 feet.
Hides, . . .	80,000.

p. 927.

The quantity of sugar exported in 1832 is not stated; but in 1826 it amounted to 32,864 *lbs.*; and it should be recollected, that about twenty years before, not an ounce of that article was manufactured on the island!—p. 926.

The imports into France, in 1831, from Hayti, **EXCEEDED IN VALUE** the imports from Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, Austria, or China.—p. 637.

Cotton manufactures, to the amount of 6,828,576 yards, were exported from Great Britain to Hayti in 1831, being about one-tenth the number of yards exported in the same time to the United States.—p. 446.

Intelligence of the agriculture of Hayti has been received, to near the close of 1836. In every point of view it does great credit to Hayti. From the "Reports made by the commanding

officers of Arondissemments to the President of Hayti, on Agriculture," we extract the following :

"Agriculture is now found further advanced than it has ever been. . . . The crop of cotton has been very abundant. . . . much attention is paid to the raising of cattle."—*Report of General Riche.*

"The highways and roads, public and private, are in good condition."—*Commune of St. Jean.*

"There have been driven from this commune, since the commencement of the month of August last, 1,053 oxen."—*Commune of Lamotte.*

"The 'total' of General Bonnet's report, reducing French *carreaux* to English acres, is as follows: 'Number of acres of land cultivated—in canes, 802; in cotton, 14,021; in coffee, 5,512; in tobacco, 3; in rice, 879; in Indian corn, 669; in millet, 267; in bananas, 344; in potatoes, 307; in manioc, 37; in ignames or *tayaux*, 90.' According to the 'observations' interspersed through the report, it appears that the quantity of provisions must be much greater than would appear from the above, for it is the practice to plant corn, bananas, potatoes, &c., between the rows of cotton and coffee. This report closes with the following summary :

“A Summary of the exportations from the port of St. Marc in the year 1835.

Products exported.	By foreign ships.	Coast- wise.	Total.
Coffee,	933,868 lbs.	333,058	1,270,946
Cotton,	646,935 do.	303,961	950,896
Mahogany,	1,835,508 ft.	48,025	2,283,533
Logwood,	208,455 lbs.	10,000	218,455
Gayac,	2,155 do.	—	2,155
Ox hides,	195 do.	196	391
Ox horns,	500 do.	300	800
Cacao,	42,085 do.	—	42,085
Tobacco,	101,430 do.	—	101,520
Product of the salines for 1835, 11,506 bls. of salt.			

General Receipts of the Treasury.

By customs,	\$72,838 43
By patents, stamps, and rents,	12,911 95
	<u>\$85,750 38.⁷/₁₀</u>

A writer in one of the newspapers, recently says, “Slaveholders and Colonizationists have long delighted to appeal to St. Domingo, as a triumphant proof, that free negroes *won't work*, and of course, as a triumphant argument against emancipation. Now, it so happens, that notwithstanding our negro hatred, we have a pretty extensive commerce with “the idle and worthless population” of St. Domingo, to use the language of Col. Stone, and it so happens, that this idle and worthless population are among our best customers.

“In most other countries we have ministers, or at least consuls, to watch over the interests of our merchants; but to send a minister or con-

sul to St. Domingo, would be so revolting to the feelings of our Southern brethren, that they would probably *threaten* to dissolve the Union, and so our merchants are left to take care of their own interests there. It may be useful to compare the *amount* of those interests with the amount of their interests in certain other countries, where we have consuls, and in some instances, ministers.

“The following comparative view is taken from a statement of the value of the imports and exports of the United States, for the year ending, 30th September, 1835, recently laid before Congress, by the Secretary of the Treasury:—

	<i>Exports to.</i>	<i>Imports from</i>
HAYTI,	\$1,815,812	\$2,347,558
Prussia,	55,745	38,543
Russia,	585,447	2,395,245
Sweden and Norway,	516,238	1,285,178
Denmark,	323,300	121,000
Dutch East Indies,	1,444,290	800,383
Belgium,	748,222	341,967
Ireland,	403,604	542,896
British East Indies,	754,058	1,697,893
Spain,	655,961	1,295,678
Portugal,	270,305	547,974
Italy,	285,941	1,457,977
Swedish West Indies,	86,355	31,330
Danish West Indies,	1,457,196	1,282,902
Dutch West Indies,	481,340	403,542
British West Indies,	1,152,347	1,838,227

It thus appears that of all the above countries, the one inhabited by free negroes buys the most from us, and with the exception of Russia, sells the most to us. Surely, this is a strange result for a people who *won't work*, and for a country in which the law forbids the use of the lash.

In a letter from Hayti, dated Port au Prince, November 6, 1836, the writer says, "the public documents I had the pleasure of transmitting to you, have almost superceded the necessity of my answering the remainder of your very interesting inquiries; but I deem it important to say to you, that the morals of the people are better than they formerly were. There are not less than fifteen male and female schools in this city; also a national college, in which sciences, languages, drawing, music, &c., are taught. We have also a Lancasterian school, in which the first principles of grammar, arithmetic, &c., are taught, and a medical school with a good faculty. These last are national schools, supported by the government.

"There is also a very great improvement in the mode of building. The buildings erected of late, do great credit to the architects and city; indeed, they far surpass the ancient French mode of building."—*Emancipator*, March 2, 1837.

No many years ago, the master of an American vessel, who had visited different ports in Europe and the United States, stated to the wri-

ter of this tract, that the custom house at Cape Haytian was under as good regulation, if not better, than the custom houses of London and New York. "The officers of the custom were all black men," said he, "and yet the order, correctness, and despatch of business, were remarkable, equalling any thing of the kind I ever saw."

"This interesting people have shown to the world," says a foreign writer, "for forty years, that black men can govern themselves, creditably maintain all the relations of civil society among themselves, and with other states, and besides paying a large indemnity to France for their independence—which they never should have submitted to—place themselves in the enviable situation of having 'a happy peasantry, a country's pride,' and having an exchequer clear of debt, which many older states cannot boast."

The state papers of the Republic of Hayti, have ever been distinguished for the ability with which they are written; and the gentlemen from that island, who have visited the United States on business, or for other purposes, have well supported the character the republicans of Hayti have established among civilized nations. Many of these individuals are men of refinement, education, and wealth. Yet, shame to this sister Republic! we refuse to recognise her independence, or to establish commercial or diplomatic relations with her government. And when her respectable citizens visit our shores, they are

treated in such a manner that they seldom repent their visits.

“The existence of slavery among us,” says Mrs. Child, “prevents the recognition of Haytian independence. That republic is fast increasing in wealth, intelligence, and refinement. Her commerce is valuable to us, and might become much more so. But our northern representatives have never even made an effort to have her independence acknowledged, because a colored ambassador would be so disagreeable to our prejudices.”

Two years since three colored gentlemen, from Port au Prince, one of them the son of the secretary of state, visited the city of New York on commercial business. They were noble looking young men, and came to establish some commercial relations. They could not procure lodgings at any Hotel in the city, and felt very indignant at the treatment they received. They carried back many of the doubloons they brought to this country to invest in goods, and were equally astonished and wounded that the circumstance of their complexion exposed them to so many inconveniences and insults, in a land boasting of its free institutions, its “liberty and equality.”

In the Journal of Commerce, the following extract of a letter has been published. The writer, from his ungenerous hint about *getting rid* of our colored fellow-citizens, is obviously not an

abolitionist, and therefore not to be suspected of any prejudices in favor of the black republic.

"I have never seen any government *really free* before. . . . Every colored person is a citizen from the moment of his arrival, and entitled, upon application to the commandant, to nine acres of good land for himself, and as much for his family. . . . The population as yet hardly amounts to a million, but there is room for ten times that number, besides all the black and colored population of the United States; and being so near, it would be well to get rid of them in that way, seeing that they bid fair to be very quiet and peaceable neighbors. You would hardly believe that all the cash remittances to the Cape and Port au Prince, a distance of nearly three hundred miles, through lonely woods, rugged precipices and deep rivers, are conveyed in the shape of doubloons by an *unarmed footman*, and that no instance of any failure or interruption is on record. The government may fairly be said to put all others to shame, by accomplishing without any apparent coercion, what all others have attempted to accomplish in vain, by complicated legislation.

Published by R. G. Williams, 143 Nassau street, New York, for the American Anti-Slavery Society

CASTE.

[Compiled, chiefly, from recent publications.]

This is an East India word, and means *tribe*. The Hindoos are divided into four castes or tribes, each of which is again subdivided into a large number of branches. "Every individual remains invariably in the caste in which he was born, practises its duties, and is debarred from ever aspiring to a higher, whatever may be his merit or his genius." In consequence of this unnatural distinction of caste, all motives to exertion are extinguished.

"The Chitties live by trade, and the Vellallas by cultivating the land. The smiths and carpenters' caste is inferior to the Vellallas. Washermen, shoemakers, and barbers, are still inferior. The Toddy-man, Paraya, &c., are still lower. The Tooroompen (which signifies a man that is not worth more than a rush), is the lowest. This last is so low a caste, that people of the high castes often strike them, if they come in contact with them. None of the high castes will eat with any of the low castes."

"The most numerous caste are the Sudras or Sooders. Their business is *servile labor*;" and their degradation is generally inhuman. They are compelled to work for the Brahmins, being

considered as created solely for their use. They are not allowed to collect property, "because such a spectacle would give pain to the Brahmins." To them "the Vedas, or sacred books, must never be read." How striking the resemblance between this and *American slavery*! Who does not recognise the same feeling and principle which creates the barrier between the whites and blacks in this country? Even here, white people generally feel a sort of Hindoo horror at the thought of sitting and eating with the blacks; and the black man, whatever be his talents or moral worth, can seldom rise.

An interesting colored man completed a thorough education at one of our colleges. The learned professions were shut against him. Not having religion to sustain him, he sank under the weight of prejudice, and fell a victim to intemperance. The writer knows of but two colleges in the land which announce that blacks will be admitted on the same footing with whites. Whole towns have been thrown into confusion by the attempt to establish colored schools. In Connecticut, Miss Crandall was thrown into prison for such an attempt, and in New Hampshire an academy was drawn into a swamp because colored youth were admitted. The colored American's money will hardly secure him a seat in a stage-coach, or a berth on board a steamboat. Even a missionary of the American Board, whose face was slightly tinged, was

dragged from the table by the captain of a Providence steamboat, because he was a "nigger."

In *religious worship* the effect of caste is similar in Hindoostan and republican America. Tissera says the low castes are kept out of the temples. They have temples exclusively for themselves, or stand outside the temples of higher castes. How much does this fact, relating to heathen customs, remind us of those of this Christian country! "Nigger seats" are found in most of our churches; and colored people, in most of our towns and villages, must sit in them, or not hear the gospel preached; and in larger towns and cities they have their temples by themselves. Whole congregations have been thrown into excitement because colored men have purchased pews, or been seated with white people; and in one instance, a colored man was excommunicated, in consequence of his son's purchasing a seat for his family. (See Mrs. Child's Oasis.)

The first missionaries in southern India undertook, like many Christian D. D's in this land, to accommodate Christianity to the prejudices of the people. Protestant missionaries, who have under their care many thousands of Hindoo converts, have allowed caste, *the most exceptionable feature of Hindooism*, to appear in full vigor at the communion table! (See Christian Brahmin, vol. 2, p. 138.)

Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, has recently re-

quired the missionaries of his church not to tolerate the distinction of caste in the native churches. And he says, "the heathen usages of caste, in the Christian churches, is the main barrier to all permanent improvement."

Bishop Corrie says, that in India, "*the different castes sat on different mats, on different sides of the church; they approached the Lord's table at different times, and had once different cups, or changed them before the lower classes began to communicate; and they had separate divisions in the burial grounds.*" Where is the difference in principle, between seating different castes on different mats, on different sides of the church, and seating whites in the centre of our churches, and the blacks on the "nigger seats?"

A Brahmin asked an Englishman if, in his country, they ate and drank together; to which the latter replied, "We deem it an honor to demean ourselves as brethren in the participation of food at one table." The Brahmin replied, "That appears to be an offence against good morals and good conduct." The gentleman replied, "Do you not, in the field of Juggernaut, eat with the lowest caste? *There you have no distinction of caste, but all feed at one board.*" The Brahmin tried to screen himself by saying, "There we are in the presence of our god, and there we can feast together." "Ah!" said the Englishman, "I can justify our practice on your own principles, *for we are everywhere in the presence of our God.*"

"They had separate divisions in the burial grounds." In the account given of the burial of a large number of persons who perished in the recent shipwreck near New York, it is stated, "The bodies having been decently enwrapped in shrouds, and laid in separate coffins, were, *with the exception of three colored bodies*, interred in one grave, the coffins being placed side by side, in one continuous row. The colored bodies were committed to the care of the colored people, and interred at the same time, and within the same enclosure." Here we see the same heathenish spirit which will not suffer the bodies of different castes to lie side by side in the same grave, lest they should *pollute each other!*

In New Haven, many years since, when the new and elegant burying ground was laid out, the "nigger's" part was fenced off at the western end of the lot. In lapse of time, it became necessary to enlarge the burying-ground, and they were obliged to enclose some acres near the western side. This brought the "niggers' graves" in the centre of this far-famed burying place! And there they are, at the present time, a practical illustration of the power and the punishment of prejudice against color, in that beautiful city. No wonder the people there opposed the establishment of a college for colored youth, and that a judge was found in that city who charged the jury that colored men are not citizens!

Wherever the distinctions of caste exist, in heathen lands, the missionaries find them the greatest obstacle in the way of converting the heathen. Christianity makes slow progress in India, of course. The same principle obstructs its progress in this country, especially in the improvement and conversion of people of color. "The colored man," says Rev. Theo. S. Wright, "is excluded from the house of God. Even at the communion table he can only partake the crumbs offered to him after others have been served. *This prejudice drives the colored man from religion.* I have often heard my brethren say they would have nothing to do with such a religion. They are driven away, and go to infidelity; for even the infidels at Tammany Hall make no distinctions on account of color."

Will this unhallowed distinction have no effect on the white man's piety? Can his soul thrive while he harbors an unjust and cruel prejudice? Has it not prevented the descent of the Holy Spirit upon congregations? If missionaries have found it necessary to set their faces against caste, in heathen lands, ought not ministers to do the same in this Christian land? Bishop Wilson well remarked, "The existence of caste, as it respects religion, must cease, or we had better abandon our missions at once."

So common a thing is it to maltreat persons of a certain color, that some who in their hearts profess to abhor it, feel compelled, as they love

their daily bread, to do it; and those who, following their hearts, refuse to follow custom, are accused of injuring, by their *ultraism*, the very cause they love. Even some abolitionists, and professing Christians, speak thus! Females feel it towards the deserving and pious of their own sex! Yes, let a white man invite a colored one to sit with him in his pew, or eat in his parlor, and what an outcry is made! Pray, what is the matter? The reply is, *would you have your daughter marry a negro?* Surely this spirit of caste, lurking among our free institutions, like the devil in paradise, is the offspring of slavery, and lives in no country apart from its parent abominations.

Is it said, prejudice against color is the result of "a principle of instinct," implanted by the Creator? Why, then, does it not exist in other countries besides this? Why, then, does not the white child recoil from its black nurse? and the parent refuse to let his offspring draw sustenance from the breast of a negro? Why do slaveholders ride, walk, nay, even sleep in the same apartments with their slaves? Why, then, do ladies and gentlemen in New York ride in their coaches with black servants, and often on the same seats? But there is no natural prejudice against color. Where the colored race has not been enslaved, this prejudice is wholly unknown.

The president of one of our literary institu-


tions, in conversation with another minister, who was trying to show that he was an enemy to slavery, and above prejudice against color, although he was in favor of separating white and colored Christians in the house of God, said, *there is no prejudice against color.*

"What is that you say?" replied the defender of caste. "I say what I mean," observed the president. "It is not prejudice against color merely that seeks to separate people in the house of God or elsewhere; but it is prejudice against condition, associated with the color of those who have been so long degraded. The slaveholder has no objection to riding with his black slave, nor walking with him, nor sleeping in the room with him; nor have northern people an absolute abhorrence to being near the blacks, provided it is manifest that they are in a degraded condition. They will permit colored people to come near them in the capacity of slaves or servants, but revolt at their taking the attitude of equals. The prejudice is against equality, and not against color."

"It never appeared to me before in this light," said the other, "but I now see that you are right, and that the separation that is made does not arise from instinctive aversion, but from pride. It must, therefore, be offensive to God, and every Christian should say, away with it!"

In proof of what has been said, we will refer to a recent fact in New York. There is, at the

present time, a Zoological Institute at No. 37 Bowery, where "birds, beasts, and reptiles are exhibited," and which attracts large crowds of visitors. In a pamphlet describing the inmates, the proprietors have the following announcement:

"A whimsical illustration of the fact that it is caste and not color, and that Americans have no objection to seeing colored people in their places of resort,  IF THEY WILL KEEP THEIR PLACE, is found in a late publication of the New-York Zoological Institute. After setting forth their claims and eulogizing their attractions, the proprietors say, in a note,

"*The proprietors wish it to be understood, that PEOPLE OF COLOR are not permitted to enter, EXCEPT WHEN IN ATTENDANCE UPON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.*"

"It is saying, 'We and our patrons, the American public, care not how many colored people come, *if they will come as servants.* But COME AS MEN they shall not.'"

"The manner in which this rule is carried out may be seen in the following letter to Rev. H. C. Wright, from a citizen of the city of New York, whose worth is well known:

"*'I was very desirous of taking my family to the Zoological Institute in the Bowery, to see the specimens of wild animals. So I hired a carriage, took my family, and went up to the place. When we drove up in front of the door, I got out and went to get a ticket. When I got to the door a well dressed man gave me a very*

hard punch in the breast with his cane, which knocked me very nearly flat upon the steps. Said I, 'What did you do that for?'

" 'Clear the door,' said he.

" 'I want to go in, sir,' said I.

" 'You cannot go in.'

" 'I am ready to pay,' said I.

" 'We don't admit *niggers*.'

" 'Why did you not tell me that colored people were not admitted before you punched me so?'

" 'If you don't clear out, I will put you in the watch-house.'

" 'Do you suppose, sir,' said I, 'that I am to be treated in this manner, and not be permitted to speak about it?'

" 'He then called for two officers to take me to the watch-house. I replied, 'I think one will be enough, as I shall offer no resistance.' The officers came—laid hold of me with great violence, and walked off with me about a hundred yards; leaving my wife and family in the carriage in front of the door. The officers now said to me, 'If we will let you go, will you say no more about it?' 'Gentlemen, do your duty, for I will come to no such terms.'

" 'They then whispered to each other a moment, and let me go. They returned to their employer, I suppose. I got into my carriage and came home, thankful for having escaped from the jaws of such savage beasts.

" 'Yours, in the bonds of the gospel,

" 'THOMAS VAN RENNSLAER.'"

Some persons are so ignorant of history, or the usages of other nations, that they do not know that prejudice against color, as it is called, is peculiar to the United States; and that the fashionable in foreign countries laugh at our absurd pride, while the pious grieve over it. The negro, it is said, is of a degraded race. But who are *you*? asks William Goodell. An American.—A descendant of the Europeans. And the Europeans, who are *they*? *Who*? The noble ones of the earth. And from whence did they derive their literature, their civilization, and their religion! Europeans were naked barbarians a few centuries ago. Yes: but they drew wisdom from the Greeks—the Romans—the Hebrews. But whence did they derive their cultivation and their letters? The Greeks and Romans were once savages.

No mention is made of the literature of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. “Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the *Egyptians*!” To whom did the Greeks and Romans look up for instruction in letters and the arts? To the *Egyptians*. They sent their sons to be educated in *Egypt*—in *Ethiopia*. But who were the Egyptians and Ethiopians? *Negroes*! Yes, negroes; with woolly hair, flat noses, and black skins; for thus they are described by Herodotus. The Greeks imagined their deities resided among the Ethiopians, and Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, was supposed to have been an African princess.

Euclid, the father of mathematical science, was a *negro*. Cypria, Cyril, and Augustin, were pious and learned Bishops and Theologians, Fathers of the Christian Church; and they were negroes! Niger, (a negro,) a Roman general, wanted but one vote in the Senate, to be elected emperor of Rome.

Mr. Birney states that the slaveholders will ever believe northern abolitionists are hypocrites until they treat free people of color *irrespective of color*. The South tauntingly asks if we would have slavery abolished, while prejudice against color remains at the North? God will not crown our efforts for emancipation with success, till we first pull out the beam that is in our own eye. The very quintessence of slavery is embodied in this prejudice. It is the keenest edge of the iron that enters into the colored man's soul. It is the main pillar of the slave system.

In a letter just received from Rev. James A. Thome of Kentucky, now on a visit to the West Indies, with Mr. Joseph Horace Kimball of New Hampshire, he says, "with respect to *prejudice*, Antigua is a *new world* to us. We see none of it, excepting among the blue aristocrats, and there it is greatly modified, and is, indeed, nothing more than the feeling which they always have toward peasantry, white or colored. The *prejudices* of our countrymen never appeared so odious and abominable before. All classes here sneer at them."

"In church, the colored people and white sit together in the same pews. I saw this in two different churches at St. Thomas. When I told some persons there, that in the churches in America, the whites make the colored people sit in one corner of the church by themselves, they were very much surprised at it. They thought it was both foolish and wicked. Indeed, I was ashamed to tell them that such a thing was done in enlightened and Christian America."

Mr. Kimball also writes from St. Thomas, "the prejudices which are so rampant against color in the United States, are hardly known here. The only expression of them which I have yet seen, is *among Americans*. People here, through all the grades of color, sit promiscuously together at church, unite in social visits and public balls, and stand side by side at the counting-house desk Colored men are also members, with whites, of military corps."

"A. de Castro, a colored man, is aid-de-camp to the Governor General of the Danish West Indies; and his son, who is said to be worth a million, is aid-de-camp to the governor of this island, and is also co-member, with white clergymen and others, of the committee of the Lancasterian school. They are both on terms of intimacy with the first white families in the island, receiving visits from the most eminent merchants, and on all occasions, being honored as much as though their skins were of Yankee whiteness."

Does the reader ask, *What shall we do?* In the first place read and commit to memory the tenth chapter of Acts and the second chapter of James. Next, remember the remarks of a Turkish chargé d'affaires to E. S. Abdy, "no Turk ever despises any one on account of his skin. I have African slaves,—when they behave ill, I do not sell them,—I dismiss them from my service. It would be against the Mahometan religion to treat any human being with disdain." Among Turks and Persians, negroes rise to the highest offices in the state. Ought not professing Christians in America to blush at the contrast?

What shall we do? Every individual is bound to do that which will convince others of the folly and wickedness of caste. He has duties as a reformer. What is it that keeps up caste? Example. And what else can throw it down? Precept without practice is notoriously powerless. It is even worse. No man's *practice* is so successfully quoted to support any sin, as his who acts contrary to, or not in accordance with, his right principle in regard to that sin. Now, whatever may be the clamor, wrath, and reviling, of any, or any number of individuals against abolitionists, for their intercourse with the colored people, I cannot but believe that to this, more than any other cause, we owe the firm hold which our doctrines have taken of the public conscience.

We may have been occasionally indiscreet in the manner, but when we give up the *matter*, I shall despair of our cause—and not till then. I must, therefore, believe it peculiarly the duty of every abolitionist, as such, to take special pains to honor, by frank, open, unconstrained courtesy, merit, whenever it appears beneath a colored skin. He should not forsake the society of whites, but he should meet the deserving colored man with the hand and heart of a *brother*. Such conduct cannot fail to be appreciated by the objects of our regard, and to have the happiest effect. It will convince all candid men, that to make the abolition of slavery successful and happy, it is only necessary to prostrate caste. I believe the conduct of Christ, in eating with publicans and sinners, conversing with the Samaritan woman, &c., illustrates both these views.

What else shall we do? Abolish invidious distinctions in the house of God. If the minister and the church will not consent to their brethren and sisters of color purchasing pews in any part of the church, or selecting their own seats and partaking *with them* at the communion of the Lord's Supper, let consistent abolitionists sit with their colored brethren in the "nigger's seat." The Apostle James says, with reference to such distinctions as are usually made, "If ye have respect to persons, YE COMMIT SIN."

It is plainly a respect of persons, says Joshua Leavitt, when churches say that the black man,

solely on account of his color, shall not sit in the house of God, unless he will occupy the negro pew; nor, though acknowledged as a Christian brother, be allowed to take the symbols of a common Saviour's death, except on a bench in the aisle, or after the rest are all served. The truth is, the churches are but just beginning to open their eyes to this ENORMOUS SIN—this outrage upon the body of Christ, in the person of his members.

"Every article of splendor in dress, every dainty viand, every delicacy of drink, passes through the hands of blacks; but when we come to the Lord's entertainment, when we all meet on the common level, as redeemed sinners, bought with the same blood, our delicacy is shocked, and our pious reception of the body of Christ is turned into loathing, if those black fingers are allowed to take a piece of bread from the plate, or those black lips to touch the consecrated cup, before our own. Is that *color*, or is it *caste*?"

Does any one suppose that if our blessed Saviour were now on earth, in this country, he would countenance the treatment colored Americans receive from their white fellow citizens, and fellow christians? Would he refuse to eat with them? Would he decline to ride with them in the stage-coach? Would he object to walk with them in the streets? Would he revolt at sitting with them in the house of God? Would

he oblige them to wait, at his table, until all the white members of the church had partaken of the emblems of his broken body and shed blood? Every truly Christian heart will immediately exclaim, **CERTAINLY NOT.** Would Jesus have done so? **NO.** Hear him say then, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, **YE HAVE DONE IT UNTO ME.**"

We have mentioned the language of the Apostle James as condemning, in a pointed manner, the spirit of caste, so rampant in this country. The attention of the reader will be directed more particularly to this "abolition" passage of holy writ. It is the second chapter of James.

"My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, [or with a white skin,] and there come in also a poor man, in vile raiment, [or a man with a black or colored skin,] and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, [or is of a white complexion,] and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, [in a pew in the broad aisle, or in the body of the church,] and say to the poor, [or man of color,] Stand thou there, [by the door,] or sit here under my footstool, [or in the "nigger's seat,"] are ye not partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts? Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the

poor of this world, [many of the colored people,] rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

“But ye have despised the poor [the people of color]. Do not rich men [the white people] oppress you, [treat you with neglect, contempt, or scorn,] and draw you to the judgment-seats? Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called? If ye fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor [thy colored brother] as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in ONE POINT, HE IS GUILTY OF ALL.”

Abolitionists profess to believe the doctrine, that “people should be treated according to their intrinsic worth, *irrespective of color*,” but even some of them decline acting out this principle. Many are the excuses. One says, “we must not brave public sentiment.” Did not Jesus Christ brave public sentiment? “He made himself of no reputation,” says the apostle, and he incurred the hatred of men by acting in opposition to their prejudices. Another says, “if sinners see that colored people sit with white people in the house of God, they will be driven away, and lose their souls.” Indeed!

An officer in one of the churches in the city of New York—a professed abolitionist—engaged

with apparent warmth as a teacher in a colored school. He was willing to have "treatment irrespective of color" inscribed upon the banner, and was determined to break down, he said, the anti-Christian prejudices of men against colored people. In a short time, a prayer meeting of the teachers and scholars was appointed. A colored man (very black, it must be acknowledged) came in, and sat upon the seat with the deacon. It was perceived that the white man looked worried and displeased.

After the meeting had closed, he was asked, "what made you so uneasy in meeting?" That black man, he observed, had no right to take that seat; he might have sat on the other side. "But you hold to the principle of treating people *irrespective of color*, do you not?" Oh, yes, replied he, but perhaps I do not understand that expression as you do. "Ah, and how do you interpret it?" Why, he remarked, it means treating them so in my heart!!

For one, I am for treating our colored brethren thus—try to forget that they are *colored*, and act accordingly. This seems to be imitating Christ, of whom it was said, "Thou regardest not the persons of men." Never shall I forget the impressive remarks made by *George Thompson* on this subject, in one of his eloquent lectures in this city. "Try to banish from your mind that there is any difference in complexion. In your thoughts, in your prayers, in all your speech and

conduct, think of your colored brother as a MAN."

This advice has been of great use to me. I pray God it may be to others. Let it be engraven on the tablet of the memory, and written as with the point of a diamond on the heart, and we shall not hear abolitionists use such expressions as the following—"have mercy upon the colored people," "we feel for the poor degraded in the midst of us," "these people," "that black man," "what colored man is that?" &c., &c.

Let us say that *man*, that *woman*, that *child*; pray for the slaves as *our brethren and sisters in bondage*; and for the free people of color as *our brethren and sisters suffering under cruel prejudice*. In this way we shall lose the idea of a distinction founded upon complexion in our own minds, and be more sensitive to evidences of it in the conduct of others. Thus our respect for colored Americans will be increased, our abhorrence of prejudice strengthened, and we shall have more sympathy for those who are treated with contumely because God has, in them, "set his image in ebony."

Abolitionists owe it to the free people of color, and to themselves, to treat them thus kindly and respectfully. Thus our theory will be reduced to practice, and we shall gain the confidence and love of those who are weighed down by oppression in the free states. Their drooping spi-

rits will be revived, their hearts will be gladdened, and they will hold up their heads as freemen. To the touching appeal, "Am I not a man and a brother?" every consistent abolitionist will promptly reply, in language and conduct, YES.

One of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society came to a village in Ohio where there was but one colored family. The head of it was a member of the church, a sensible, pious, and highly respected woman. The agent visited her, and was much pleased with the neat and respectable appearance of the dwelling and the children, and especially with the intelligence and piety of the mother. They knelt down, and prayed together for the poor slaves, for slaveholders, the despised people of color, the land of their birth, the church of Christ, the anti-slavery cause. During one part of the interview, the woman burst into tears. The agent inquired the reason. The answer was, "you are the only white person that ever called me sister!" Yet this woman was a sister in the Church, and both the minister and members spoke of her as an exemplary Christian.

It is the spirit of caste that helps to keep alive the expatriation-scheme. Nothing will tend more to cover it with universal opprobrium, than for abolitionists to treat the people of color as they treat other persons, and to speak of them as they do of other countrymen. Even the *title* of

Mrs. Child's "Appeal in favor of *that class of Americans called Africans*," did much to conciliate the hearts of men to the people of color, and to open their eyes to the wickedness of that prejudice that seeks to remove them to a far distant land. We conclude this tract by an extract from the "Appeal" of the consistent and uncompromising writer alluded to.

"Our prejudice against the blacks is founded in sheer pride; and it originates in the circumstance that people of color only, are universally allowed to be slaves. We made slavery, and slavery makes the prejudice. No christian, who questions his own conscience, can justify himself in indulging the feeling. The removal of this prejudice is not a matter of opinion—it is a matter of *duty*. We have no right to palliate a feeling, sinful in itself, and highly injurious to a large number of our fellow-beings.

"Let us no longer act upon the narrow-minded idea, that we must always continue to do wrong, because we have so long been in the habit of doing it. That there is no *necessity* for the prejudice is shown by facts. In England, it exists to a much less degree than it does here. If a respectable colored person enters a church there, the pews are readily opened to him; if he appears at an inn, room is made for him at the table, and no laughter or winking, reminds him that he belongs to an outcast race.

"A highly respectable English gentleman re-

siding in this country has often remarked, that nothing filled him with such utter astonishment as our prejudice with regard to color. There is now in old England a negro, with whose name, parentage, and history, I am well acquainted, who was sold into West Indian slavery by his New-England master; (I know *his* name.) The unfortunate negro became free by the kindness of an individual, and has now a handsome little property and the command of a vessel. He must take care not to come into the ports of our Southern republics!—The anecdote of Prince Saunders is well known; but it will bear repeating. He called upon an American family, then residing in London. The fashionable breakfast hour was very late, and the family were still seated at the table. The lady fidgeted between the contending claims of politeness and prejudice. At last, when all but herself had risen from the table, she said, as if struck by a sudden thought, ‘Mr. Saunders, I forgot to ask if you had breakfasted.’ ‘I thank you, madam,’ replied the colored gentleman; ‘but I have engaged to breakfast with the Prince Regent this morning.’

“Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Brougham have often been seen in the streets of London, walking arm in arm with people of color. The same thing is true of Brissot, Lafayette, and several other distinguished Frenchmen. In this city, I never but once saw such an instance: When the Philadelphia company were here last sum-

mer, I met one of the officers walking arm in arm with a fine-looking black musician. The circumstance gave me a good deal of respect for the white man; for I thought he must have kind feelings and correct principles, thus fearlessly to throw off a worse than idle prejudice.

"In Brazil, people of color are lawyers, clergymen, merchants and military officers; and in the Portuguese, as well as the Spanish settlements, intermarriages bring no degradation. On the shores of the Levant, some of the wealthiest merchants are black. If we were accustomed to see intelligent and polished negroes, the prejudice would soon disappear. There is certainly no law of our nature which makes a *dark color* repugnant to our feelings. We admire the swarthy beauties of Spain; and the finest forms of statuary are often preferred in bronze. If the whole world were allowed to vote on the question, there would probably be a plurality in favor of complexions decidedly dark. Every body knows how much the Africans were amused at the sight of Mungo Park, and what an ugly misfortune they considered his pale color, prominent nose, and thin lips."

Published by R. G. Williams, 143 Nassau street, New York, for the American Anti-Slavery Society.

COLONIZATION.

[Compiled, chiefly, from recent publications.]

ORIGIN OF AMERICAN COLONIZATION.

As early as 1777, Mr. Jefferson proposed a plan for colonizing the free colored people of the United States in some of the western vacant lands. But the project proved abortive.

In 1787, Dr. Thornton, of Washington, formed a scheme for establishing a colony on the western coast of Africa, and published an address to the people of color in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, inviting them to accompany him. This project also failed.

On the 31st December, 1800, the following passed the House of Delegates, of Virginia, in *secret session* :

"Resolved, That the governor [James Monroe] be requested to correspond with the President of the United States [Thomas Jefferson] on the subject of purchasing lands without the limits of this state, whither persons obnoxious to the laws, or dangerous to the peace of society, may be removed."

President Jefferson in his reply, seemed to think the West Indies, especially St. Domingo,

a more eligible place, for the removal of the free people of color, than any part of this continent; and remarked, "Africa would offer a last and undoubted resort, if *all others, more desirable, should fail us.*"

On the 16th January, 1802, resolutions passed both branches of the Virginia legislature, requesting the governor to correspond with the President of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining a place without the limits of the same, "to which free negroes or mulattoes, and such negroes or mulattoes as may be emancipated, *may be sent* or choose to remove as a place of asylum;" and, "to request of the President of the United States, in procuring the lands, to prefer the continent of Africa, or any of the Spanish or Portuguese settlements in South America."

The General Assembly of Virginia, January 22, 1805, passed a resolution instructing their senators, and requesting their representatives, in congress, to "exert their best efforts, for the purpose of obtaining, from the General Government, a competent portion of territory, in the country of Louisiana, to be appropriated to the residence of such people of color, as have been, or shall be emancipated in Virginia, or *may hereafter become dangerous to the public safety.*" Governor Page, in communicating the resolution to the senators and representatives, says, "from the nature of the delicate business contemplated

in the resolution, you will see the propriety of its being considered confidential."—Af. Rep. vol. 8, p. 97 to 106.

In 1816, the subject was again brought forward in the legislature of Virginia, and a resolution was adopted, requesting the Executive to correspond with the President of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining a territory on the coast of Africa, or *at some other place*.

After laboring in vain for sixteen years, the project was abandoned by the legislature of Virginia, and a meeting was called in Washington, 21st December, 1816, Hon. H. CLAY presiding, for the purpose of forming a Colonization Society. It has been stated, that every one who spoke at its formation was a slaveholder! In the memorial of the managers of the Society to congress, soon after the organization, it is stated, "this brief and correct history of the origin of the American Colonization Society, evinces that it sprung from a deep solicitude for *southern* interests, and among the most competent to discern, and to promote them."

Such was the origin of this notorious Society! Yet the public have often been told that it originated with a few pious individuals, and with a view to the temporal and spiritual good of the colored people in America and Africa!!

In the African Repository, Vol. i, No. i, it is stated that the Colonization Society owes its existence principally to the Rev. ROBERT FINLEY,

of New Jersey. It is said he began in 1816 to disclose to his friends and to the public, the scheme which he had been, for some time, meditating, and which he prosecuted, "until principally through his instrumentality, the Colonization Society was formed at Washington, in December, 1816." In a letter from Mr. Finley, dated 14th February, 1815, he says, "Could they (the free blacks) be sent back to Africa, a threefold benefit would arise. *We should be cleared of them*—we should send to Africa a population partly civilized and Christianized, for its benefit. And our blacks, themselves, would be put in a better situation."

On the other hand, General CHARLES FENTON MERCER, a Virginian slaveholder, claims the honor of being the founder of the colony of Liberia. "At a public dinner given last week (Af. Rep. Vol. ix, No. ix, p. 265) to Gen. C. F. Mercer, at Charleston, Virginia, the seventh regular toast was the following: 'Our friend and guest, CHARLES F. MERCER—The founder of the Colony of Liberia,' " &c. General Mercer made a speech on the occasion. He said, "with respect to the first of them (the colonization scheme,) I can truly say, that the intelligence broke in upon me, like a ray of light through the profoundest gloom, and by a mere accident which occurred in *the spring of 1816*; that upon two several occasions, very early in the present century, the General Assembly of Virginia had

invited the aid of the United States to obtain a territory, beyond their limits, wherein to colonize certain portions of our colored population. For the evidence of these facts, then new to me, I was referred to the clerk of the senate, by the friend who revealed them, and in the private records of that body, I found them verified.

"It was then too near the close of the session of the legislature to attempt immediate action on the subject; but in a few weeks after this, I concerted with FRANCIS S. KEY, of Georgetown, and ELIAS B. CALDWELL, of Washington, District of Columbia, a plan for doing so; and bound to no concealment, myself, though the facts which had been disclosed to me, were from the secret journals of the senate, *I made them publicly known*, in several states, as well as through our own, on my way to the North, during the ensuing summer, receiving, everywhere, promises of pecuniary aid, and of active co-operation, provided, as I announced it to be my intention, I renewed a similar proposition at the next session of our General Assembly.

"Accordingly, in December, 1816, prior to the organization of the American Colonization Society, but with a view to its approaching formation," General Mercer presented to the House of Delegates, in Virginia, a resolution asking the aid of the General Government "to procure in Africa, *or elsewhere*, beyond the limits of the United States, a territory in which to colonize

our free people of color," &c. After the organization of the American Colonization Society, General Mercer states that he organized several Auxiliary Societies, made sundry addresses at Baltimore, and with the aid of Mr. Key and a Mr. Purviance, obtained near \$5,000 to defray the expenses of the first expedition to the coast of Africa.

OBJECT OF THE SOCIETY.

THE second article of the constitution is in the following language:—

“The object to which its attention is to be *exclusively* directed, is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of color residing in our country, in Africa, or *such other place*, as congress shall deem most expedient.”

Such other place! It was not the good of Africa, then, that was contemplated by the founders of this Society. No! It (the Colonization Society) sprung, as we have seen, “from a deep solicitude for southern interests,” and by those “most competent to discern and to promote them.” That is, the object of the Society was to *protect domestic slavery* in the United States by removing free people of color out of the country. And the evangelizing of Africa was not thought of. The expatriated people of color were to be sent to Africa, or *elsewhere*!

James G. Birney, when an agent of the Colonization Society, stated publicly at New Orleans,

that the object of the Society was to render slave property more secure by sending from the country the free people of color whose residence here tended to disaffect the slaves. Other authorized agents of the Society have repeatedly stated the same thing *at the South*, though at the North a different language has been held. *Here* it has been stated, that the effect of the Society is to deliver the country from slavery.

Mr. Archer, of Virginia, at one of the annual meetings of the Society, in discussing the principles of the Society, said, "its design was to provide and keep open a drain for the excess of increase beyond the occasions of profitable employment. This might be done effectually by an extension of the plan of the Society." And this statement went forth to the world uncontradicted, and with the sanction of the managers of the Society.

"By removing these people, (free blacks,) we rid ourselves of a large party who will always be ready to assist our slaves in any mischievous design they may conceive."—Address to a Colonization Society in Virginia.—*Af. Rep.*, vol. i, p. 176.

"Are they, (the free blacks,) VIPERS, sucking our blood? We will HURL them from us."—Address to the Lynchburgh Colonization Society. *Af. Rep.* vol. iii, p. 201.

Is it said these agents, and this distinguished friend of the Society, uttered their individual opinions only? Hear, then, the managers them-

selves. In the second Report, p. 9, they declare that the "colonization of the *free* people of color, will render the *slave who remains* in America, more obedient, more faithful, more honest, and consequently more *useful to his master.*"

OBJECTIONS TO THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

1st Objection.—OPPOSITION OF THE COLORED PEOPLE.

It is a remarkable fact, creditable to the judgment, sagacity, and forethought of the principal people of color in the United States, that at an early period, and unbiased by abolitionists or others, they saw the true character of the Colonization Society, and warned their people of its principles, designs, and results. It has been repeatedly stated, we know, that Mr. Garrison, and others, have influenced the colored population to this early and unfailing opposition to the Society. But the colored people denounced it before Mr. Garrison was twelve years old! In December, 1816, the Society was formed. In January, 1817, only one month after, the free people of color, at a public meeting, at Philadelphia, James Forten in the chair, passed several resolutions against the project of expatriating them to Africa, or some other place, and in August of the same year, published an appeal to the "humane and benevolent inhabitants" of the city of Penn, in which they said, "We humbly, respectfully, and

fervently entreat and beseech your disapprobation of the plan of colonization now offered by the "American Society for colonizing the free people of color of the United States."

The people of color not only deemed the Society hostile to their welfare, but also detrimental to the slave. In their Appeal they say, "let not a purpose be assisted which will stay the cause of the entire abolition of slavery in the United States, and which may defeat it altogether; which proffers to those who do not ask for them, what it calls *benefits*, but which they consider *injuries*, and which must insure to the multitudes whose prayers can only reach you through us, *misery, sufferings, and perpetual slavery.*"

Such have been the sentiments of the great body of the free people of color, ever since the formation of the Colonization Society to the present time. Many intelligent colored men have visited Liberia, and returned. The intelligence they have brought has been circulated among their people, and has confirmed their dislike to a Society, the principle of which they so instinctively comprehended at its first announcement. The memorable examination of THOMAS C. BROWN, at Chatham Street Chapel, New York, will not be forgotten, nor the testimony since given by Governor PINNEY, corroborating Mr. Brown's statements. [See an account of the conversation between Governor Pinney and WILLIAM GOODELL in the "Friend of Man."]

2d Objection.—*The Society has made itself an auxiliary in the expulsion of the people of color.*

R. J. Breckenridge, at the annual meeting of the Colonization Society, in 1834, stated, with reference to some of the emigrants, that they “were COERCED as truly as if it had been done with a CART-WHIP.”

Mr. Brodnax, in the Virginia legislature, said, “it is idle to talk about not resorting to force. Every body must look to the introduction of FORCE of some kind or other.”

The legislature of Maryland appropriated \$200,000 in aid of the Maryland Colonization Society, and the “Baltimore Chronicle,” alluding to the acts of the state, avows that “the intention of these laws was, and their effect must be, to EXPEL the free people of color from the state.”

Louis Sheridan, a colored native of North Carolina; a man of good education, and considerable property, was in New York two or three years since. He was asked his opinion of the Colonization Society. “It is,” said he, “the greatest delusion that ever was practised upon the American people.” He said, in addition, that he had formerly been a preacher of the gospel, but the state enacted a law that no free man of color should preach. He then went into mercantile pursuits, and while absent from the state to purchase goods, his house was entered, and the keys of his drawers and desks were broken in search of abolition publications. “And now,

if I am not back in ninety days," said he, "my real estate will be forfeited to the state." Lately it has been boastingly stated in the colonization newspapers, that Mr. Sheridan was about to emigrate to Liberia. Oppression will drive him there.

3d Objection.—*The Colonization Society colonizes slaves.*

The object to which the attention of the Society is to be *exclusively* devoted, (as stated in the article of the constitution already quoted), is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing the free people of color, with their consent. Here three things are stated.

1. "Free people of color" only are to be colonized.

2. They are to be colonized "with their consent."

3. The attention of the Society is to be "exclusively" devoted to these objects.

Now see how the Society has disregarded its own constitution. A large part of the persons transported to Africa, since the Society was organized, have been *slaves*. They have been manumitted on condition that they would leave this, their native country, and go to the coast of Africa. They have been sent as *slaves*, carried across the Atlantic as *slaves*, and landed on the shores of Africa as *slaves*. This may surprise some readers. But a distinguished colonizationist was asked, what would be the fate of the

emigrants, if by stress of weather a ship bound to Liberia should be obliged to put back to the United States, after having performed half or two thirds of the passage. "They would be remanded into slavery," said he. How then can they be called "*free people of color*?" The Society, be it remembered, cannot, by its constitution, remove any but free people of color, and that with their own consent. "It violates its constitution then, the moment it carries away a *slave*. Every slave that goes, goes as a slave or a freeman. If as a slave, it is not as a free colored person that he goes. If as a freeman, he is free only on condition that he goes to Africa, and he goes therefore, not as a freeman with his own consent, but at best, as a freeman with a *slave's* consent."

Again, the alternative is presented to the slave of expatriation, or perpetual slavery. He chooses the former. Is this *with his consent*? Emancipate the slave, then offer him the choice of living in his native country, or seeking an exile in Africa. If, under these circumstances, he elects to be colonized, he goes with his own consent; but not otherwise.

4th Objection.—*The Society not hostile to slavery.*

We have a right to judge of the principles and character of a Society, by those of the men elected to preside over and manage its concerns. Of the whole number of officers of this Society, nearly three-fourths are slaveholders, or interest-

ed in slave property ; and not one of them has emancipated any of his slaves, even to be sent to Liberia !

Judge WASHINGTON, the first president of the Society, offered a large reward for a runaway female slave, to any person who would secure her by putting her into any jail within the United States. While in that office, he also sold fifty four of his slaves at Mount Vernon for the southern market, tearing husbands and wives, parents and children, asunder forever. And with this fact known to the public, he was still elected president of the Society from year to year, to the day of his death, eight whole years ; and after his death Mr. Gurley pronounced his eulogy, and said he was a man that had always been actuated by the *noblest* feelings !

The second president, CHARLES CARROLL, *one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence*, owned nearly *one thousand slaves*, and never emancipated one ! JAMES MADISON, the third president, bequeathed to the society \$4000, and to his heirs, ONE HUNDRED human beings. HENRY CLAY, the fourth president, early declared that he had no intention of sending *his slaves* to Africa, and yet in his recent letter accepting the office of president, he considers the Society the best scheme ever devised for effecting an entire separation of the two races !*

* A writer in the New-York Observer, of April 8, 1837, states that on reading a speech of Rev. R. R.

The colonization of free people, or slaves, whom their masters are willing to set free, tends to promote slavery or strengthen it. It quells the desire of liberty in the slave. It relieves the consciences of masters, who begin to feel their guilt. How natural, and yet how remarkable it is, that slaveholders in view of death are much more disposed to emancipate their slaves on the soil, than to expatriate them to Africa. Like JOHN RANDOLPH, the word REMORSE afflicts them, and they do not like to die as slaveholders.

5th Objection.—*It introduces the free blacks, sanctions and strengthens the existing prejudice against them, discourages and opposes their elevation in this country, and countenances oppression to induce emigration.*

“Why do you wish to send our free people of color to Africa?” asked a friend of man. Because they never can rise here, was the reply. “Why not rise here?” Because they are a degraded race. “Why are they so?” They are ignorant and vicious. “Why are they so?” Because they are black. “But blacks rise in other countries.” They never will here. “Why?”

Gurley, at a recent meeting of “the State Colonization Society of Virginia,” he was “disappointed and chagrined” at reading the following sentiment.—“We seek to confer benefits on two races of men, to *relieve* one country, and regenerate another.” Here they are “nuisances;” expatriated to *Africa*, they become “missionaries.”—But observe, “Men who cross the sea change their climate, not their disposition.”

Our prejudices are too strong. "Aye, that is the difficulty;" but this prejudice is voluntary, cruel, unchristian, peculiar to this country, displeasing to God. The Colonization Society *strengthens* this prejudice, for it proceeds upon the supposition that it is involuntary and invincible, so that the blacks cannot rise here. Fifty years ago, Dr. Belknap spoke of the prejudice against people of color as a prejudice of "the vulgar." How is it now?

"Free blacks are a greater nuisance than even slaves themselves."—Af. Rep. II, 328.

"An anomalous race of beings, the most debased upon earth."—Af. Rep. III, 230.

6th Objection.—*In its publications it apologizes for slavery—justifies the sin of slaveholding—and "cries peace" to all who perpetrate it.*

"We hold their slaves, as we hold their other property, SACRED."—*Speech of James S. Green, Esquire.*

"Policy, and even the voice of humanity, forbade the progress of manumission; and the salutary hand of law came forward to co-operate with our convictions, and to arrest the flow of our feelings, and the ardor of our desires."—Af. Rep. vol. iv, p. 268.

7th Objection.—*It tends to fortify the system of slavery, by making it EASIER, SAFER, more reputable, and MORE PROFITABLE for masters to hold slaves; and it URGES this tendency as a claim upon the patronage of slaveholders.*

“The execution of this scheme would augment, instead of diminishing, the value of property left behind.”—*Af. Rep.* vol. i, p. 227.

8th Objection.—*It condemns immediate emancipation, and emancipation in any way which permits the emancipated to remain in this country.*

“Emancipation, with the liberty to remain on this side of the Atlantic, is but an act of dreamy madness.”—*Speech of Mr. Custis, 13th Annual Report.*

“We would say, liberate them ONLY on condition of their going to Africa or Hayti.”—*Af. Rep.* III, 26.

9th Objection.—*It denounces and vilifies all who advocate immediate emancipation.*

“It (the Society) is nowise mingled or confounded with the broad sweeping views of a few fanatics in America, who would urge us on to the sudden and total abolition of slavery.”—*Af. Rep.* III, 197.

“Come, ye abolitionists, away with your wild enthusiasm, your misguided philanthropy.”—*Af. Rep.* VII, 100.

10th Objection.—*It opposes the instruction of slaves.*

“It is the business of the free (their safety requires it) to keep the slaves in ignorance.”—*N. Y. State Colonization Society's proceedings, 2d anniversary.*

11th Objection.—*It lowers the tone of public sentiment upon the subject of slavery—weakens*

the abhorrence of its abominations—and blunts public sympathy.

“The slaveholder, so far from having just cause to complain of the Colonization Society, has reason to congratulate himself that in this institution a channel is opened up, in which the public feeling and public action can flow on without doing violence to *his rights*.”—14th Report, pp. 12 and 13.

12th Objection.—*It holds one language at the South, and another at the North.*

“It (the Society) has no intention to open the door to universal liberty.”—Af. Rep. III, 187.

“It has no wish to interfere with the delicate and important subject of slavery.”—Af. Rep. XII.

“The Colonization Society has hitherto been generally looked upon as the instrument which was to rid our North American continent of the entire black race.”—R. J. Breckenridge, 1834.

13th Objection.—*Colonization is an impossible remedy.*

It would not cost much less than two hundred millions of dollars to carry the colored population across the ocean, allowing them to be taken off at the rate of *one hundred thousand annually*, or 500 shiploads of 200 each, for *fifty years*! Then, how shall they be taken care of on the other side? and who will supply their places on the plantations at the South?

14th Objection.—*The example of the colonists has been injurious to good morals.*

Prejudice has been encouraged at Liberia:

The colonists have treated the natives in other respects as the whites treat colored people in the United States. Rev. J. B. Pinney, a missionary, and since governor of the colony, says, in a letter dated Monrovia, Feb. 20, 1833, "nothing has been done for the natives, hitherto, by the colonists, except to educate a few who were in their families in the capacity of servants." The same distinction that exists in America between *colors* exists there, owing to difference in mode of dress and other causes: "A colonist of any dye would, if at all respectable, think himself degraded by marrying a native. The natives are in fact *mentals*."

Rev. Gov. Ashmun gained great "glory" by a battle he fought with the natives. It was stated, in the report of this bloody conflict, that "every shot literally spent its force in a solid mass of living human flesh." And it has even been asserted that the missionaries of the cross will never be able to extend the Christian religion unless it be done under the military protection of the colony!

The RUM and POWDER TRADE have been extensively prosecuted by the colonists under the auspices of the Colonization Society. We extract from the eleventh report the following terms of a contract: "The American Colonization Society shall have the right, in consideration of 500 bars of tobacco, 3 barrels of rum, 5 casks of powder, 10 guns, &c., to enter into possession of the tract," &c. The Sesters

Territory was perpetually leased to the Colonization Society in 1825, "in consideration of one hogshhead of tobacco, one puncheon of rum," &c., to be paid, if we rightly remember, annually.

In the "Liberia Herald," March 22, 1832, was advertised by C. M. Waring and F. Taylor, "500 kegs of powder, 500 muskets, 150 cutlasses, 10 bags shot, 10 puncheons rum, 2 puncheons brandy," &c. In the same newspaper of September 7, 1832, C. M. Waring advertises "60 doz. spear-pointed knives, 10,000 musket flints, 1,197 gallons of rum, 350 kegs of powder, 140 muskets," &c. C. M. Waring, be it remembered, was at the time a preacher of the gospel!

J. B. Russwurm, editor of the Liberia Herald, in a letter dated Nov. 18, 1829, says, "tobacco, RUM, pipes, cloth, iron pots, POWDER, and SHOT, are considered the *currency* of the country. Nothing can be done without *rum* in trade with the natives." Mr. Ashmun declared that *rum* was indispensable in trading with the natives. Mr. Gurley, in the African Repository, January, 1831, says, "in the judgment of the most worthy colonists, the native traders would *entirely abandon the colony*, were ardent spirits entirely excluded from its commerce."

Is it said these things were done a long time ago, viz., in 1829 and in 1832; and in that *remote period*, more than half the people in this country were in the daily use of ardent spirit? To this we reply. If the laws governing the people of this country eight or five years since,

had been framed by a Board styling themselves benevolent or religious, and the chief magistrate had been appointed by this Board, it would have been marvellous indeed if they had permitted the traffic in ardent spirit, spear-pointed knives, and powder.

The colony at Liberia has been and is under the control of the Colonization Society, more than the missionary stations are under the control of the Board of Foreign Missions. They could have suppressed the sale of rum, had they been so inclined. We take pleasure in saying that recently measures have been taken to prevent the sale of this poison by persons immediately connected with the Society; and it is to be hoped that the traffic will be totally abolished, as it might have been years ago, if the managers of the Colonization Society had so willed.

15th Objection.—*The influence of the colonies upon religion is highly injurious.*

It is stated in the MISSIONARY HERALD, June, 1834, that Messrs. Wilson and Wynkoop, in selecting a site for a mission settlement near Cape Palmas, chose to be half a mile distant from the colony, and say it was "from apprehension that the colony might embarrass our future efforts for the improvement of the natives," and "we took all the pains we could to impress the mind of the king and his people with the fact, that the mission is to be entirely distinct from the colony, and will be identified with the interests of the natives."

Joseph Horace Kimball, now on a mission from the American Anti-Slavery Society to the West Indies, writes from Antigua that he had a long conversation with Rev. William Satchell, who is stationed at Montserrat. He spent the five years previous to July, 1825, among the Caffres in Africa. "I inquired of Mr. S.," says Mr. K., "what he thought of uniting trading colonies with missionary stations. I shall long remember the 'holy indignation' of his look and voice when he replied. The sentences inclosed in parenthesis are his very words, which are too deeply impressed on my mind ever to be forgotten. ('You might as well think to ally THE BOTTOMLESS PIT WITH THE NEW JERUSALEM. It is mingling light and darkness. It is attempting to do the work of God through the aid and agency of Satan.')

"He says the commerce carried on with the natives is a system of deception and fraud. The conduct of the traders creates suspicion and jealousies against *all* white men, and obstacles almost insurmountable are thus thrown in the way of the missionary. His color is the same as that of the traders, his religion is of the same name, and his language is the same. The hearts of the natives are shut against him."

Mr. Clay said that every colonist is a missionary, not to preach merely, but to enforce the claims of religion by example. And yet, in regard to the free people of color, he, in the same speech, pronounced them the vilest of the whole

population—worse than the slaves. “What sort of Christianity,” asked C. C. Burleigh, “will such men introduce into Africa? . . . We cannot Christianize men into a better religion than we have got ourselves. Until, then, we see that the religion of the United States has put down the slave prisons in the city of Washington, and in Alexandria—until it has opened the prison doors of the captive in this land—has proclaimed liberty to all the inhabitants thereof, we cannot see that this same Christianity is going to abolish slavery in Africa.”

“Shall the Christianity of one continent make it the home of oppression, and yet make another continent the home of freedom? If we should convert the natives of Africa to our Christianity in the way proposed, why should they not *act* as we do? Why should our Christianity make them any better than it does us? . . . Why should we expect that Christians will be better made in Africa than in America? . . . The fact is, until this nation is brought back to primitive and pure Christianity, vain is the attempt to convert Africa to such a Christianity, by means of a slaveholding and slave-trading Christianity.”

“None desire the Christianizing of Africa more than do abolitionists. But they do not desire that the muddy waters of a corrupt Christianity should be poured over that continent.”

Gov. J. B. Pinney's conversation with Wm. Goodell has already been alluded to. It occur-

red May 6, 1836, and was taken down at the time. After J. B. P. had stated that while at Liberia he had the fever *almost incessantly*, although the climate agreed better with him than *with almost any other person* who has visited it, the dialogue continued:

"W. G. What is there doing for the conversion of the natives in the vicinity of Liberia?"

"J. B. P. Nothing.

"W. G. Is the war with King Joe Harris terminated?"

"J. B. P. Yes; he was glad to make peace on any terms.—(After a pause)—The war was a piece of boy's play on the part of the colonists.

"W. G. (After a pause, and doubting his meaning.)—A piece of boy's play, did you say, sir? In what respect do you mean?"

"J. B. P. I mean that the war was provoked on the part of the colonists.

"W. G. In what manner?"

"J. B. P. The burning of the native villages was the immediate cause.

"W. G. I had heard something of that matter, sir; but I supposed it would be claimed by the colonists that this was in retaliation of some previous injuries from the natives.

"J. B. P. In the previous controversy, I suppose the blame was about equal between the parties. It was a mere question about a little property. A piece of boy's play. Five dollars would have settled the whole matter.

"Mr. Pinney was of opinion that the slave

trade was, on the whole, impeded by the colony. Many slaves used to be shipped from that spot formerly.

“W. G. But what prevents their being shipped from other points of the coast?

“J. B. P. The colony occupies the best anchorage grounds for an extent of two hundred miles. The colony likewise affords facilities for information to the British cruisers who hover round the coast.

“W. G. But does it not also furnish facilities for the slavers? Is not its commerce adapted to these purposes?

“J. B. P. To some extent this may be true; but I think not to an extent equalling the checks it imposes on the traffic.

“W. G. From some quarter the slave-trade is still carried on with great activity. Some people think it equal to that of any former period.

“J. B. P. This must be from the coast of Guinea.

“W. G. Your colony, I suppose, exerts little or no influence for the suppression of the traffic there.

“J. B. P. None at all, sir.

“W. G. But the principal part of the traffic, I suppose, has always been from that coast?

“J. B. P. Yes, sir.”

MORAL CONDITION

OF

SLAVES.

[Compiled, chiefly, from recent publications.]

The physical debasement and misery of the slaves in the United States, have often been dwelt upon until the heart has bled, and tears of sympathy have fallen from the eyes of the philanthropist. Such degradation and suffering are enough to awaken deep emotion, and excite to strong effort to relieve the oppressed from the grasp of tyranny. But how much more occasion have we to deplore the degradation and enslavement of the human soul! It is proposed in this little tract to give facts respecting the moral condition of slaves.

The testimony now presented is chiefly from the land of slavery; it is the evidence of disinterested persons who were born, and have long lived, in the midst of it; men who are intimately acquainted with slaveholders, and with slaves; men who have been conversant also with freemen, and with the condition of things in the free states. Their testimony is impartial. "Whoso hath ears to hear let him hear."

THE LICENTIOUSNESS OF SLAVERY.

At the first anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, May, 1834, JAMES A. THOME, of Kentucky, made a disclosure of the licentiousness which grows out of the slave system in his own state. He closed it with the following emphatic words :

“I would not fail to have you understand that this is a *general* evil. Sir, what I now say, I say from deliberate conviction of its truth ; let it be felt in the North, and rolled back upon the South, that the slave states are Sodoms, and almost every village family is a brothel. (In this, I refer to the inmates of the kitchen, and not to the whites.) Let me be understood here : this pollution is the offspring of slavery ; it springs not from the *character* of the *negro*, but from the *condition* of the *slave*.”

On the very next day in which the above was uttered, and while the statement was denied at a colonization meeting, Mr. Thome's charge was fully sustained by the WESTERN LUMINARY, printed at Lexington, Kentucky. A most remarkable and providential coincidence. The editor in the same slave state of which Mr. Thome had spoken, sent forth, without concert, an independent and almost simultaneous testimony to the very same effect, as follows :

“There is one topic to which I will allude, which will serve to establish the heathenism of

this population ; for I wish this truth to be known to our *eastern brethren*, that if we ourselves will do nothing, *they* may make our negroes an object of missionary attention. I allude to the **UNIVERSAL LICENTIOUSNESS** which prevails. It may be said emphatically, that *chastity is no virtue among them*—that its violation neither injures female character in their own estimation, or that of their master or mistress—no instruction is ever given, *no censure pronounced*. I speak not of the world. I **SPEAK OF CHRISTIAN FAMILIES GENERALLY**. How much longer shall this state of things be unregarded ?”

Rev. E. M. P. WELLS, an Episcopal clergyman of Boston, said, soon after the speech of Mr. Thome, he had just conversed with a clergyman who left the South in consequence of slavery, and who told him that what the gentleman from Kentucky said was true, and he *had not told half of what was true*.* And he thought these statements came with peculiar propriety and power from a *young man*. The evil was terrible among young men. He believed there was scarcely a young man in the South but was more or less contaminated with it. JAMES G. BIRNEY told the writer of this tract he believed there was

* Slavery in Kentucky, be it remembered, is a different thing from what it is in many of the slave states at the South. If, then, such things are done in Kentucky, what must be the moral condition of slaves and slaveholders at the South ?

scarcely a young man of eighteen years of age, living in a slave state, who was not addicted to this sin.

In the Report of the Synod of Georgia, December, 1833, it is stated as follows: "*Chastity*, in either sex, is an exceedingly rare virtue. Such is the universality and greatness of the vice of lewdness, that to those who are acquainted with slave countries, not a word need be said. On a subject like this, we suffer not ourselves to speak. *All* the consequences of this vice are to be seen, not excepting *infanticide* itself!"

In the circular of the "Kentucky Union for the moral and religious improvement of the colored race" (a society formed of some of the most distinguished gentlemen, both of the clergy and laity, at Lexington, Ken:), to the ministers of the gospel in the state, they say:

"To the female character among the black population, we cannot allude but with feelings of the bitterest shame. A similar condition of moral pollution, and utter disregard of a pure and virtuous reputation, is to be found only *without the pale of Christendom*. That such a state of society should exist in a Christian nation, claiming to be the most enlightened upon earth, without calling forth any particular attention to its existence, though ever before our eyes and in our families, is a moral phenomenon at once unaccountable and disgraceful."

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS IGNORANCE OF THE
SLAVES.

In an official report of the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, embracing all the ministers and lay representatives from all the churches of that denomination in those two states, adopted at its session in Columbia, S. C., and published by order of the Synod, in the Charleston Observer of March 22, 1834, it is stated—

“Who would credit it, that in these years of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian Republic, there are over *two millions* of *human beings*, in the condition of HEATHEN, and, in some respects, *in a worse condition?*”

The Synod, by their committee, proceed to say, “from long continued and close observation, we believe that their (the colored population’s) moral and religious condition is such, as that they may justly be considered the *heathen* of this Christian country, and will *bear comparison with heathen in any country in the world.*”

“Before we attempt to set forth the duty [to evangelize these ‘heathen’], it will be proper to show, that the negroes are destitute of the privileges of the gospel, and *ever will be under the present state of things.*” There are some exceptions to this, they say, and they “rejoice” in it; but “although our assertion is BROAD, we believe, that, in general, it will be found to be correct.”

"It is universally the fact," say the Synod, "throughout the slaveholding states, that either custom or law prohibits to them the acquisition of letters, and consequently they can have NO ACCESS TO THE SCRIPTURES;* . . . so that they are dependant for their knowledge and Christianity, upon oral instruction; *as much so as the unlettered heathen when first visited by our missionaries.*"

But it is often said, the means of grace abound in slaveholding states; that, although *policy* induces the masters to prohibit, under severe penalties, the acquisition of letters, yet much *oral* instruction is given of a religious nature. Were an abolitionist to deny this, he would be accused of misrepresentation. Let us attend, then, to the testimony of slaveholders themselves.

The Synod, before mentioned, proceed in their report as follows:

"Have they, then, that amount of oral instruction, which, in their circumstances, is necessary to the enjoyment of the gospel? In other words, *have they a regular and efficient ministry?* **THEY HAVE NOT.** *In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river; and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not TWELVE men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes! . . . The number ["two millions of souls and more"] di-*

* "Search the Scriptures."

vided between them, would give to each a charge of near one hundred and seventy thousand !!!”

It is frequently said, however, that although there may not be many *white* ministers preaching exclusively to the slaves, yet they have preachers of their own color, intelligent and pious men, who break to them the bread of life. Listen to the testimony of the Synod on this point:

“As to ministers of their own color, they are destitute infinitely both in point of numbers and qualifications; to say nothing of the fact, that such a ministry is looked upon with distrust, and is discountenanced by the present state of feeling in the South, *such a ministry could neither be obtained NOR TOLERATED.*”

How often is it stated that the slaves have religious instruction, through the stated ministry of the whites? We hear of the accommodations furnished them in the churches; that whole galleries are frequently given up to them, and that extra meetings are often held for their special benefit. It is well to listen to the testimony of the Synod on this point also.

“But do not the negroes have access to the gospel, through the stated ministry of the whites? *We answer NO!* The white population itself is but partially supplied with ministers. Such being the fact, what becomes of the colored? And the question may be asked with still greater emphasis, when we *know that it has not been cus-*

tomary for our ministers when they accept calls for settlement, to consider servants as a regular part of their charge. . . . If we take the supply of ministers to the whites now in the field, the amount of their labors in behalf of the negroes is small."

The Synod assert that something has been done towards the "religious instruction of the negroes;" but they say, "we venture the assertion, that if we take the whole number of ministers in the slaveholding states, but a *very small portion pay any attention to them. . . .* No effort is made to draw them out" (to church); but let them "come to hear the preaching of ministers to white congregations, and such is the elevation of their language, &c., . . . they might as well preach in Hebrew or Greek. The negroes do not understand them. Hence their stupid looks, &c., . . . and their *thin attendance.*"

Some readers may be ready to inquire, is not this dreadful picture of heathenism confined to the southern states? Let a Kentuckian Christian answer. A writer in the Lexington, (Ky.) *WESTERN LUMINARY*, remarks—

"I proclaim it abroad to the Christian world, that *heathenism* is as real in the slave states as it is in the South Sea Islands, and that our negroes are as justly objects of attention to the American and other Boards of foreign missions, as the Indians of the western wilds. What is it

that constitutes heathenism? Is it to be destitute of a knowledge of God—of his holy word—never to have heard hardly a sentence of it read through life—to know little or nothing of the history, character, instruction, and mission of Jesus Christ—to be almost totally devoid of moral knowledge and feeling—of sentiments and probity—truth—and of *chastity*? If this constitutes heathenism, then there are thousands, millions of heathen in our own beloved land.

“Gracious God! Merciful Redeemer! Shall thy Word and thy gospel be proclaimed in simplicity and truth to one portion of our population, and shall another be born, and live, and die, where the Sun of Righteousness shines freely and fully, and never receive more than a dim and wandering ray of his light and glory!”

Not many years ago a protracted meeting was held at Petersburg, Virginia. During the first two days, the attendance was very great. The ministers were much encouraged. The prospect was that many souls would be converted. It was suggested that the third day had best be devoted entirely to the religious instruction of the colored part of the population. The ministers acceded to the request, notice was given accordingly, in the church, and throughout the place, and masters were requested to give their slaves liberty to attend the whole day, so that the church might be filled. Great excitement prevailed. A meeting of slaveholders was held.

A threatening message was sent to the ministers. The consequence was that the protracted meeting was broken up, there being no meeting after the second day. In whose skirts will be found the blood of those souls that may perish in consequence of the breaking up of that protracted meeting?

A correspondent of the *CHURCH ADVOCATE*, published in Kentucky, uses the following language, in relation to the blacks of that state:

"The poor negroes are left in the ways of spiritual darkness, no efforts are being made for their enlightenment, no seed is being sown in this portion of our Lord's vineyard: here nothing but a moral wilderness is seen, over which the soul sickens—the heart of Christian sympathy bleeds. Here nothing is presented but a moral waste, as extensive as our influence, as appalling as the valley of death to the unrepenting, conscience-stricken sinner."

The following extracts are from a letter of Bishop Andrew, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, directed to Messrs. Garrit & Maffit.

"Augusta, Jan. 29, 1835.

"The Christians of the South owe a heavy debt to slaves on their plantations, and the ministers of Christ especially are debtors to the whole slave population. I fear a cry goes up to heaven on this subject against us; and how, I ask, shall the scores who have left the ministry of the Word, that they may make corn and cotton,

and buy and sell, and get gain, meet this cry at the bar of God? and what shall the hundreds of money-making and money-loving masters, who have grown rich by the toil and sweat of their slaves, and *left their souls to perish*, say when they go with them to the judgment of the great day?"

The following testimony with regard to the slaves in Alabama, is from a letter published in the Southern Religious Telegraph, and is dated June 20, 1836.

"Yesterday afternoon, I attended divine service in this place. The afternoon sermon is always intended especially for the blacks. The number present yesterday was probably over 400. Rev. Mr. Houp informed me that preaching was not kept up regularly in any other Methodist church in Middle Alabama, except Montgomery. I have myself visited all the Presbyterian churches belonging to Tuscaloosa and South Alabama Presbyteries, except Mobile and three others, and have found the *blacks almost entirely neglected in all but two.*"

An unblushing statement was made some time since, by a minister from North Carolina, that the people of the South build churches, hire ministers, establish Sunday schools, and then themselves and their daughters go and sit down on the same seat with their "black chattels," to teach them the truths of the Bible. What says the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia?—

that next to nothing of this kind is done at the South—that, although there is “here and there a master” who “feels interested in the salvation of his servants, and is attempting something towards it,” “in general, it does not enter into his arrangement of plantations to make provision for their religious instruction; and that so far as *masters* are engaged in this work, an *almost unbroken silence reigns over the vast field.*”

In confirmation of the above, we refer to the following passage in the address of the Synod of Kentucky, of December, 1835:

“The light of three or four sabbath schools is seen, glimmering through the darkness that covers the black population of a whole state. Here and there a family is found, where humanity and religion impel the master, mistress, or children, to the laborious task of private instruction. . . . But, after all, what is the utmost amount of instruction given to slaves? Those who enjoy the most of it are fed with the crumbs of knowledge which fall from their master’s table—they are clothed with the mere shreds and tatters of learning.”

The Rev. Mr. Converse, who was at one period an agent of the Colonization Society, and resided for some time in Virginia, states in a discourse before the Vermont Colonization Society, that “almost nothing is done to instruct the slaves in the principles and duties of the Christian religion. The laws of the South

strictly forbid their being taught to read; and they make no provision for their being orally instructed. Ministers sometimes preach to them under peculiar and severe restrictions of the law. But with all that has yet been done, the majority are emphatically *heathens*, and what is very strange, heathens in the midst of a land of sabbaths and of churches, of Bibles and of Christians. . . . Pious masters (with some honorable exceptions) are criminally negligent of giving religious instruction to their slaves. . . . They can and do instruct their own children, and *perhaps* their house servants; while those called "field hands" live, and labor, and die, without being told by their pious masters (?) that Jesus Christ died to save sinners."

It has recently been stated in the newspapers, that 70,000 slaves belong to one denomination of Christians. To say nothing of the fact that "married" slaves of both sexes, who belong to the different churches, when sold into other states, form *new connexions*, and yet are received into churches as members "in good and regular standing," we will quote the testimony of a Christian minister, born and reared in a slaveholding community, as to the *piety* of those who are denominated Christians by their masters.

Dr. NELSON, late president of Marion college, Missouri, states (in the St. Louis Observer) that he has been acquainted with slaves as church members all his life; that he has heard

hundreds make such professions of love to God and trust in a Saviour, that the Church did not feel at liberty to refuse them membership. Still he thinks they were "poor, deluded, mistaken creatures." The concentrated recollection of thirty years, says Dr. N., "furnishes me with three instances *only*, where I could say I have reason, from the known walk of that slave, to believe him, or her, a *sincere Christian*." Dr. N. says the reason is easily understood by all who know the effects of slavery upon the human mind. The slave is trained every day to act as he does not feel. Insincerity becomes his second nature.

The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in their report already quoted, say, "The whole (of the negroes), professors and non-professors, are low in the scale of intelligence and morality, and we are astonished thus to find Christianity in absolute conjunction with heathenism, and yet conferring few or no benefits."

A Virginian writer, in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* (N. Y.) of 2d October, 1835, says, "these slaves do not receive the gospel from white tyrants, even when they are permitted to go and hear it. But hundreds of thousands cannot hear it. The blood of their bodies, and of the countless souls that inhabit them, rests somewhere." The same writer, speaking of the reluctance of the slaves to receive religious instruction from those who make merchandise of

hem, says, "so great is their opposition lest their consciences should be bound, that they will often retire to their labors at a very early hour, rather than remain for morning devotions."

Dr. Nelson, in his letter to the ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church, says, "Dear brethren, the blacks in your church do not understand the plan of salvation. Scarcely one in ten of your colored members understand one solitary doctrine of the gospel. If you doubt this, let me know it, and let me assemble them, and, in your presence, ask each one of them six questions. I know, that if you will ask them who Christ was, they will tell you, the *Saviour of sinners*, and that we must trust in him, &c. &c., but they answer mechanically, or imitatingly. *They do not know any thing of it.* Go to them yourself, and vary the shape of your questions, and you will make a discovery, if you doubt for a moment. I ask you in the name of *eternity*, do this. Ask them six plain questions, on some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. They are preached to. They are not learning. And never will, whilst they are slaves—never, never, whilst they are slaves. A few solitary exceptions alter not these facts."

Rev. ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY, editor of the Alton (Ill.) Observer, and who formerly edited a newspaper in the state of Missouri, in his paper of the 9th of March, 1837, expresses "unfeigned astonishment" that any one can, for a moment,

listen to such statements as are put forth by Rev. Mr. Bailey, (formerly of Massachusetts, and now teaching an academy in a slave state,) concerning the moral and religious condition of slaves, "in the face of so much overwhelming evidence to the contrary." These statements are refuted, says Mr. L., by the circumstances of the case. "They cannot, in the very nature of things, be true. You cannot brutalize and Christianize a class of human beings at the same time. Besides, Mr. B. is contradicted by ninety-nine out of every hundred disinterested witnesses who have had an opportunity of knowing the facts."

Mr. L. very naturally inquires, "why believe Mr. B. in preference to the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, who testify that the slaves among them may be properly called heathen? Similar testimony is given by the Synod of Kentucky, and very much similar by the Synod of Tennessee."

"I know in Missouri," says Mr. L., "two slaves, a man and a woman, (husband and wife, as they are called, though, in fact, this relation does not, and cannot subsist,) who are both members of the Presbyterian church. I have heard the woman curse and swear, and use the most outrageous and indecent language a hundred times or more; and I have been with white members of the same church when they heard this language, yet did I never hear them rebuke her for her conduct, and she still retains her

place in the church, and so far as the church records show, is as good a Christian as any one of its members. The husband, though not so openly wicked, I have seen busily at work all the Sabbath day, in the yard of a house where lived some of his brother white members. I have seen him, when thus at work, frequently drink at the whiskey bottle; and when I informed some Christian members of the family in whose yard he was laboring of what he was doing, and urged upon them the propriety and duty of putting a stop to his labors, they excused themselves from interfering on the plea that he was not their property!—‘Did not belong to them,’ was the phrase.

“The picture will be complete when I add that this is the second man with whom the woman has lived, and had children by, as her husband, while her former husband is still living in the same place. Such is a specimen of Mr. Bailey’s ‘church members.’ I might mention other cases which have come to my knowledge, as going to show the dreadful moral condition of the slaves, but I forbear; and some of them are of a nature not to be mentioned. I will only add, on this point, that being a few days since in Missouri, and conversing with a friend who resided in a village containing from 1200 to 1500 inhabitants, I asked him how many chaste female slaves he supposed there were in that village of the age of twenty years and upwards, and his reply was, ‘Not one.’ Now this man was a

competent witness, as he has long resided in the place, is a member of the Church and an officer in it, and is himself a slaveholder."

Mr. Lovejoy concludes by saying, "to be a slave is to be denied the privilege of reading the gospel of the Son of God, to have no control over my own children, and consequently to be deprived of the power and means of educating them in the principles of morality and religion. In one word, it is to be degraded from a man to a brute—to become, instead of a free moral agent, a **THING**, a piece of property, and to be used as such—to be deprived of all personal and all civil rights—to be shut out from all enjoyment in this world, and all hope in the next."*

Another writer,† speaking of the pernicious tendency of the system of slavery, to corrupt the moral sense, remarks, "So degrading is the nature of slavery, that fortitude of mind is lost as free agency is restrained. To the same cause probably must be imputed their propensity to conceal or violate the truth; which is so general that I think the vice of falsehood is one of the most prominent features in their character. If a negro is asked even an indifferent question by his master, he seldom gives an immediate reply;

* Of course it is not pretended that this is true of **EVERY** individual case, but the exceptions are so few as not to affect the general definition.

† Bryan Edwards' *History of the West Indies*, Vol. 2, Book 4, p. 72.

but affecting not to understand what is said, compels a repetition of the question, that he may have time to consider, not what is the true answer, but what is the most politic one for him to give."

There are a few, even in the slave states, who tell the truth respecting the religious destitution of the colored population. Already have we quoted the language of the editor of the Western (Ken.) Luminary, respecting the universal licentiousness that prevail among the slaves. We cannot forbear to give additional extracts respecting the moral and religious ignorance of the black population. If such things exist in the State of Kentucky, what must be the condition of slaves in most of the slave states?

"Let it be remembered, that the opportunities for religious instruction *of the most favored portion of the blacks*, is far inferior to those of *the least favored portion of the whites*. The latter can almost universally read the word of God, and have actually read it more or less, or heard it read, and its doctrines conversed about and canvassed, both publicly and privately; . . all classes of the white population, rich and poor, intelligent and ignorant, mingle freely together in society, and knowledge and information are, by this social intercourse, generally disseminated through all ranks; and, lastly, in the most destitute places, the gospel is frequently preached. But the black population are **WHOLLY DESTITUTE** of *all these advantages*."

Ability to read the Bible. "It is a well known fact, that to meet with a black person who can read and understand the Bible, is considered a PHENOMENON, and excites wonder and astonishment. When it is said that Kentucky has been supplied with the Bible, let it be remembered, that *one-fourth of her population* are as ignorant of its contents as if they were not inhabitants of a Christian country. . . The poor black has never had the word of his God and Saviour even read to him. If he belongs to a *Christian family*, nay, even to the family of a *Christian minister*, his religious opportunities are no better than if he lived in *the family of an infidel*.

"While his master assembles his household night and morning around the family altar, and reads in their hearing the gracious words of Him 'who spake as never man spake,' the poor negro is *no more thought of than the cattle of the field*. AN IMMORTAL BEING may grow up in a Christian family, and live threescore years and ten, and have never received *a word* of Christian instruction, have never been informed of 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world' !!! 'Is this true?' asks the editor; "WHO CAN DENY IT? . . The black population is an isolated mass of ignorance, through whose dark body a ray of light hardly ever penetrates; and if, perchance, a fortuitous beam now and then enters, it is lost in the midst of surrounding darkness.

"The black population have not the gospel

preached to them AT ALL! No, not at all! It is true, a *small portion* of them attend the religious instruction addressed to the whites. Seated in some distant corner of the house, as if they were 'aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise,' as if they had no part nor lot in the matter, they are *spectators* rather than *hearers*. The preacher does not address *them*; whilst he directs his remarks to every other part of his audience, he never casts an eye towards these forgotten and degraded beings! He feels no sympathy with them, nor they with him.

"Let those who read these remarks, and who doubt that the appellation of *heathen* is applicable to the blacks of this country, institute an inquiry into the facts. Let them address the first of this population they meet, and inquire into their religious knowledge, not in general and indefinite terms, but *by minute and definite inquiries*, and I am persuaded that the appellation will be found appropriate."

In the address of the Synod of Kentucky, already quoted, it is said, slavery deprives its subjects, in a great measure, of the privileges of the gospel. "The law, *as it is in Kentucky*, does not prevent the free access of the blacks to the Scriptures; but ignorance does. The Bible is before them, but it is to them a sealed book. 'The light shineth in the darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not.' Very few

enjoy the advantages of a *regular gospel ministry*. . . . There are no houses of worship exclusively devoted to the colored population. The galleries of our own churches, which are set apart to their use, would not hold the tenth part of their numbers; and even these few seats are, in general, thinly occupied. So that, as a body, it is evident that our slaves do not enjoy the public ordinances of religion.

"Domestic means of grace are *still more rare* among them. Here and there a family is found, where servants are taught to bow with their masters around the fireside altar. But their peculiarly adverse circumstances, combined with the natural alienation of their hearts from God, render abortive the slight efforts of most masters to induce their attendance on the domestic services of religion.

"And if we visit the cottages of those slaves who live apart from their masters, when do we find them reading their Bibles, and kneeling together before a throne of mercy? *Family ordinances of religion are almost unknown among the blacks.*"

These statements, be it remembered, are the testimonies of persons living in *slave states*, of editors of religious newspapers, and ministers of the gospel. They come, too, from a state where slavery exists with as many mitigations as are found in this country. The fact is, the means of grace are scanty, with regard to the

colored population of this country; and where slavery prevails, the blacks do not avail themselves of the advantages, such as they are, that are near them. The slaves "do not receive the gospel from WHITE TYRANTS, even where they are permitted to go and hear it." And "so great is their opposition, lest their consciences should be bound, that *they will often retire to their labors at a very early hour, rather than remain for morning devotions.*" They attribute, naturally enough, the apparent interest expressed for them by their masters to motives connected with gain. They do not believe in the reality of a religion that seems to them to countenance oppression. But if they were disposed to go and hear the gospel preached, hundreds of thousands would be excluded. "The blood of these bodies, and of the COUNTLESS SOULS that inhabit them, rests somewhere. A part of it is on the hands of all who encourage slavery," or apologise for it, or traduce its opposers. And no small part either!

REV. JOHN RANKIN, of Ohio, formerly a minister in Kentucky, says, in his "Letters on American Slavery," "the whole system of slavery is unfavorable in its consequences as well as its nature, to the extension of gospel influence. . . . It is undeniable, that many of the slaveholding clergy and ruling elders do not teach their slaves to read the sacred scriptures, nor even cause them to attend upon their family devotion! . . .

Hence I must still conclude that gross ignorance in the enslaved must be the CERTAIN RESULT of involuntary slavery, even *where it assumes its mildest form.*"

Rev. C. C. JONES, of Georgia, not long since, prepared an essay under the direction of the Presbytery of Georgia, touching the moral and religious condition of slaves. This gentleman has since been appointed professor in the Theological Seminary of Columbia, S. C. In reply to the question, "Has the negro access to the Scriptures?" he says, "The statutes of our respective states forbid it; or when, through some oversight, *they* do not, *custom* does. On the one hand he cannot be a *hearer* of the law, for oral instruction is but sparingly afforded him; and on the other hand, he cannot *search the scriptures*, for a knowledge of letters he has not, and cannot legally obtain." Mr. Jones says further: "It is a solemn fact which we must not conceal, that their private and public religious instruction forms no part of the aim of owners generally. There is no anxiety, no effort made to obtain such instruction. The great, the absorbing aim is, to work them profitably. *They are shut out from our sympathies and efforts as immortal beings, and are educated and disciplined as creatures of profit, and of profit only, for this world.*"

Published by R. G. Williams, 143 Nassau street, New York, for the American Anti-Slavery Society.

WHAT IS ABOLITION?

MANY falsehoods have been told about abolitionists and members of anti-slavery societies. It is but common fairness to hear what they have to say for themselves.

Before we enter upon the main question, viz. "What is abolitionism?" we will just state what it is *not*, that the minds of any who have had wrong views may be set right.

First, then, abolitionists do not preach *amalgamation*, or the mixture of the white and colored races. This misrepresentation has been got up by our enemies to prejudice people against abolitionists. They would make you believe that our object is to flood the North with a multitude of degraded beings from the South, coming to lay claim to all our rights as citizens, to be our rulers, our judges, our lawyers, and our physicians, and *to marry our sons and daughters!*

Abolitionists do not teach any such doctrine. They say nothing about the blacks intermarrying with the whites, because they consider that they have nothing to do with that question. That must be left to people to decide for themselves.

No one is so absurd as to suppose, that the blacks any more than the whites will ever mix in general society before they are qualified to do so

on equal terms. No one will ever be compelled, in this free country, to take a black wife or a black husband, depend upon it. But there is one thing which we wish every reader to understand fully. The abolitionists *do aim* at destroying the *amalgamation* which exists in the South, and which is almost *universal*. The abolition of slavery will do this, and nothing else will.

Secondly, neither do abolitionists desire the *dissolution of the Union*. They fully believe that, if ever the golden cord which holds these states together, is severed, it will be because of the existence of slavery. So far are they from desiring that the Union should be dissolved, they are among its firmest friends, and their great effort is to open the eyes of the community to the real danger which threatens the union of the states. They only repeat the sentiments of Franklin and Jay and other great men, who helped to form our present constitution. They feel that slavery is a worm eating at the root of the tree of liberty, and they are seeking to destroy it, before our liberties, bought at so great a price, shall be for ever destroyed.

Thirdly, neither do abolitionists hold to *exciting the slaves to murder their masters*. By no means ! On the contrary, they all disclaim any thing like a resort to physical force, even to obtain freedom. Most of them adopt peace principles. Hence their great reliance is, under God, upon the *power of truth*. This they believe to be a mighty

weapon when wielded by the arm of faith and love, and one which even slavery itself cannot long withstand. They hope by it to reach the conscience of the *slaveholder*, but make no appeals to the *slave*. All their arguments are directed to the *slaveholder*, their publications are sent to him, and the effect produced must be upon the *slaveholder's* heart and conscience.

We believe that so far from the discussion of this question having tended to excite insurrection at the South, it has tended, more than any thing else, to keep the slaves quiet and obedient. Because they know that efforts are making in their behalf, and any disorder among them would injure, and not advance their own cause. Even slaveholders have admitted this.

What, then, it will be asked, do abolitionists propose to do? We will endeavor, in a few words, to state their object, and then answer some objections commonly urged against their doctrines and measures.

I. *They wish to diffuse correct views as to what slavery is.* Many who profess to know much about slavery, when you come to ask them what they imagine slavery to be, will reply, "Oh! It is being compelled to work against your will." Others will say, "It consists in withholding certain natural rights." Others, "In not being eligible to office." Others, "In cruelty and oppression." "Privation of trial by jury." "Apprenticeship." "Bondage for crime,

&c. &c." But these are only appendages, things which belong to some forms of servitude, while neither of them go to make a man a *slave*.

What, then, is slavery? We define it to be, the taking *man* and reducing him to the level of a *thing*: subjecting God's image, made for glory, honor, and immortality, to the rank of a commodity, to be bought and sold and bartered for filthy lucre. In this consists the very essence of slavery, that it takes away from man those things which distinguish him from the brute, thus leaving him subject to the avarice, lust, and cupidity of his fellow-man.

It being, then, the first principle of slavery to blot out the image thus stamped on man at creation, and make him a mere tool to answer the purpose of others, what, it may be asked, is the *actual condition* of the slave?

First, He is subject to the absolute and despotic sway of his master. So that, according to the laws of the state of Louisiana, "The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but which must belong to his master." Slavery, then, puts it in the power of the master to do with the slave whatever he pleases. If he chooses to make him work eighteen hours a day the slave must obey; or to deprive him of necessary and wholesome food, the slave has no redress; or to sell him as he would a horse, the slave must submit.

Second, We find that the *laws* of slaveholding states know no such thing as marriage among slaves. Hence these laws nullify the command of God, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife," and subject the whole slave population to a state of horrid, promiscuous intercourse.

Third, Masters are not prohibited by law from inflicting severe punishment upon their slaves, so as often to cause death. In South Carolina, "If a slave be killed on a sudden heat or passion, or by *modus correctionis*, the murderer is to pay a fine and be imprisoned six months." And not once in a hundred, can *white witnesses* be found to testify in case of the murderer; so that he most generally escapes unharmed.

Fourth, A slave has no legal protection whatever against any abuse and violence.

Fifth, Slaves have no control over their wives or children, and can own no property. They may be, and frequently are sold to brutal masters, torn from their families, and never permitted to see their faces again.

Sixth, Slaves are subject to tyrannical laws in the slave states. In Virginia, there are seventy-one offences punishable with *death*, when committed by slaves, which are only punished by *imprisonment* when committed by whites.

Seventh, Slaves are not permitted to have or to read the Bible. According to the laws of North Carolina, to teach a slave to read or write

or to sell or give him any book (Bible not excepted) is punishable with thirty-nine lashes, or imprisonment, if the offender be a free negro, but if a white, then with a fine of two hundred dollars. In Louisiana, the penalty for teaching a slave to read or write is one year's imprisonment. Thus are nearly three millions of God's accountable creatures prevented from obeying the command, "Search the Scriptures."

But—Eighth, The slaves can hold no religious meetings in many of the slave states, without the presence of several white men. In Virginia, *all evening meetings* are strictly forbidden.

II. We wish to bring men at the North to lift up their voices and cry aloud against this heinous system of oppression. The great difficulty is, to convince men of the necessity and duty of bearing testimony against this sin. But if slavery is what we have defined it to be; if it is such a system of abominations, concentrating in itself all that is bad, is it not plainly our duty to do all that we can to abolish it?

God has not left us in doubt on this point, when he has commanded us, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor and not suffer sin upon him." We believe the upholders of slavery to be guilty of one of the greatest sins which can be committed against God. They are guilty of trampling upon the rights, the heaven-conferred rights of man, and subjecting him to an awful condition of physical, intellectual, and

moral degradation. And now, whatever we can do to unrivet these chains, we are morally bound to do. We want every man, woman, and child, in this land, that can understand what slavery is, and can feel for the oppressed, to raise his voice against it.

III. We wish *as soon as possible* to knock off the fetters from the limbs of the slave. When we use the term *immediate emancipation*, we do not mean to say that this *will* be done in a moment, but that it *ought* to be. Ministers preach the duty of immediate repentance and wish, though they do not expect that all sinners may repent at once. So abolitionists preach the doctrine of immediate emancipation. We know that we have to encounter strong prejudices, from education, habit, self-interest, force of public opinion, &c. But we believe that the only way to accomplish any great good is, to set *immediately* about it.

We can make no compromise with sin. If slavery is a *crying sin*, we hold that it is the slaveholder's duty straightway to abandon it. God abhors it, and he commands us to proclaim the truth in the ears of slaveholders, until "every yoke shall be broken, and the oppressed shall everywhere go free."

IV. Having stated our object, the question may be asked, how do you propose to accomplish it? We hope to accomplish it by the simple means which God has placed in our hands, the *unceasing proclamation of truth*. The

weapons of abolitionists are no armor forged by human hands, but those polished weapons of God's own workmanship, which are so powerful when wielded aright. Our only confidence is in the influence of correct principles, everywhere made known, and brought rightly to bear upon the minds and consciences of slaveholders.

Do you say, in opposition to our doctrines and measures, that *abolitionists want us to associate with the blacks, and to take them into our families ? This we will never consent to do ?*

Abolitionists never held any such doctrine as that men should intermarry with colored people, or take them into their families, unless they choose so to do. Abolitionists aim at destroying the *prejudice* which would shut out the colored man from our churches, our public conveyances, our public houses, and even from our burying-grounds, and treating colored men as whites ought to be treated, according to their moral characters. They say that prejudice is unjustifiable, and ought to be immediately abandoned. It is not the mere color of the skin which makes one man better than another in the sight of God.

But, "*is not the black man naturally inferior to the whites,*" says one, "*and has not God made a plain distinction between the two, which we cannot destroy ?*" We answer, no. God made of "one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." He has given the colored man naturally the same mind, that he has given to the white

man. The reason, we say, why many of them now appear to be inferior is a very plain reason. It is because they have been denied entrance to our schools and our seminaries, been forbidden by public sentiment to practice the common trades, and been degraded and oppressed by cruel laws, so that they could not rise, if they would. Abolitionists say, take away this prejudice, remove these oppressive laws, and then the colored man will have a fair opportunity, and see if he will not rise, as he has everywhere done when he had an equal chance. It seems very cruel to trample him into the dust, and then blame him for being where he is.

But the slaves are very well taken care of, we often hear said, and why make them worse off than they now are, by emancipating them?

What would you, my friend, consider good treatment, were you in the condition of the slave? Would you think it good treatment to be denied the use of your limbs, of your time, the privilege of having your wife and children around you, of attending church when you pleased, and reading the Bible and other books, and teaching your children to read? Would you think it enough to have a scanty allowance of food and clothing, or even an abundance, if, at the same time you knew that you were a *slave*, and must obey the will of a brutal master? What man here would be willing to *take the place of the slave*? Not one.

But, says another, the slaveholders are not so cruel as they have been represented. To be sure, all the slaveholders are not equally severe to their slaves. Some, perhaps, give them enough to eat, and drink, and wear, and do not overwork them. We do not say that every master is cruel to his slaves, more than every man is cruel to his horse. But we say, that *slavery*, say of it what you may, is A SYSTEM OF CRUELTY, OF OPPRESSION, AND ROBBERY, and it ought for ever to cease. We say the guilt of slavery consists in robbing a man of all he has, and making a brute of him, and as long as you deny him the use of his own limbs, wages for his labor, and opportunity to improve his condition, you *cannot treat him well as a man.*

But it is said, *it will do no good to discuss this subject at the North. How can we hope to abolish slavery?* We reply it will do great good. Every thing depends upon the stand taken by northern men on this question. A correct public opinion *here* will produce a correct public opinion throughout the country. As long as the North slumbers, and suffers the work of death to go on, there is no hope of deliverance. But let the North wake up, and bring in her united and decided testimony against slavery, and she will no longer stalk abroad as she now does, in open noon-day, but will seek to hide herself where light will no longer penetrate.

Slavery is one of the foulest deeds of darkness,

and nothing she more dreads than a free exposure to light.

Is it objected to the discussion of this question, that *we have nothing to do with slavery at the North* ? *Northern men* are the last who should bring forward such an objection as this, as long as slavery owes its very continuance to the base connivance of northern men, and to their continued sanction and approval. It is a burning shame that we ever had any connexion with slavery, and a still greater reproach that we have done so little for its removal.

But it will be said, *we have always been opposed to slavery at the North*, and why do you want us to add any new testimony on this subject ? We answer, let the mobs and newspaper assaults upon those who have labored to suppress this evil within the last three years, speak for themselves on that subject. The North opposed to slavery ! when most of the persecution against abolitionists has come from *northern editors and northern men* ! No ! until the mobs of 1834 in New York, and the scenes of violence since, shall be blotted out of the records of history, let us not say that the North have always borne testimony against the sin of slavery. How little *practical evidence* have northern men given for the last half century that they have been opposed to slavery !

But, again, is it said, that the discussion of this subject *only irritates the minds of slaveholders*,

and can do no possible good ! If these principles are, as we believe, based on eternal truth, can it be true that it will do no good to utter them in the ears of slaveholders, however they may seem now closed against them ? See what has been done for temperance by speaking out plainly respecting the evils of intemperance.

It is not true that we have not succeeded in convincing slaveholders of the sinfulness of slavery and the necessity of its abandonment. Were we to appeal to facts on this subject, we could produce ample proof of the good effects of free discussion on the South. Mr. Birney, and others who have been brought up slaveholders, have come out nobly on the side of freedom, and are now decidedly in favor of immediate emancipation. To show that they are men of *deeds* as well as *words*, they have liberated their slaves, and paid them wages of labor. And it works well !

But it is said, that we *have no right to touch this question. We are interfering with the rights of property at the South.* Is it unlawful to persuade men to give up what does not morally belong to them ? Besides, what right has the slaveholder to what he calls his property in man ? Did God give him a right to enslave the bodies and souls of his fellow men and make them marketable commodities ? No such right was ever bestowed. The slaveholder's only claim to the bodies of his slaves is, the right recognised

only among savages, the right of the *strongest*. Hence, we say that this is a *system of robbery* and as such, we feel it to be our duty mildly, yet forcibly, to bear witness against it, and beseech men to renounce it.

But does not *the constitution sanction slavery* ? No ! the constitution, to be sure, says something about *persons held to service*, but not a word about master and slave. But what if it did sanction the existence of slavery, could that make right, wrong, or wrong, right ? We say that slavery is *wrong, and therefore ought to be abolished*.

But the constitution secures to every citizen full liberty of speech and of the press. Certainly, then, it cannot be *unconstitutional* for us to endeavor to show our southern brethren wherein consists the wrong of holding men as slaves. We have long disclaimed any right of interference by law with slavery in the several states. But we have not resigned, nor will we ever resign, our right freely to discuss this subject, and to endeavour to convince men of their duty.

Again, says another, *the blacks if emancipated, will flood the North, and hence emancipation is unsafe*. There is no ground for believing that if emancipation were to take place to-day, the slaves would not be far better off, and more contented to work on the soil, than they now are. They have been brought up in a southern clime, there is their home, there they have labored and toiled together, and there all their associations

centre. Now emancipate them, and pay them wages, and they would choose to live where their fathers lived, and die where they died, and lay their bones by their side. Besides, the blacks have so long been upon the soil, and have become so adapted to it by constitution and habit, that they are the only proper laboring class in that community. The constitution of the whites could not well endure the fatigue necessary to the cultivation of the southern soil. Again, if the colored people ever were to leave the southern states, their place must be supplied with emigrants from Europe. Does the South prefer exchanging the colored for an Irish population?

We hear it sometimes said, *the slaves, if set free, cannot take care of themselves. Why, then, throw them all at once, loose upon the community?* But this objection goes upon a mistaken supposition. It supposes that the slaves, under the stimulus of the lash, will work, and support both their masters and themselves, but take them out from under this stimulus, and let them feel that their bodies and limbs are their own, and it would make them indolent, and incompetent to support themselves. Ask the free working men at the North which stimulus is the best for them, the lash or wages!

But, says another, *the slaves are not prepared for freedom.* We must take time to educate them, and then they will be fitted to enjoy their rights. Abolitionists contend that they are as

much prepared *now*, as they ever will be, while they are slaves. You cannot educate a slave to be a freeman. What ! to bring men to appreciate their rights, shall we rob them of the last vestige of those rights, manacle and fetter them, put them under a system which shuts them out from the light of science, of civilization, of morality, and then say we are *educating* them for freedom ! No ! give them the Bible, restore to them their free-agency, take them out from under illegal and place them under legal restraints, and then see whether they will not rapidly rise to the level of good citizens.

But it is asked, *does not the Bible sanction slavery ?* If Jesus Christ and his apostles and holy men of old did not disapprove of it, why should we make so much ado about it ? It is often asserted, but no proof whatever brought forward, that Jesus Christ and the apostles sanctioned slavery. If "doing to others, as you would that others should do to you," and "loving your neighbor as yourself," are the doctrines of slaveholders, then Christ undoubtedly did preach up slavery. But I never yet heard of a slaveholder who quoted these words as authority for holding slaves !

Again, if the command given by the apostle Paul to masters, "Render unto your servants that which is *just and equal*," were fully carried out by all who accuse him of being a supporter of slavery, I should like to know whether men could rob their fellow-men of body and soul and

all they have, and then say they have only carried out the apostle's direction.

The truth is, though the New Testament does not mention the word *slavery*, any more than it mentions *piracy*, which was very common in those days, it lays down rules for our guidance which cut up both slavery and piracy by the roots. It may be added, that slavery did not exist in Judea in the days of Christ.

But, says one, did not Paul send Onesimus, a runaway slave, back to his master Philemon? True, Paul *did advise* Onesimus, after his conversion, to return to his former master. But was it as a slave that Philemon was to receive him? No! by no means! What says Paul in the epistle? "Receive him *not now as a servant*, but above a servant, a BROTHER BELOVED." "If thou count me a partner, receive him as *myself*." A rule very few slaveholders will adopt! And one that would not be of much assistance in riveting the chains upon their slaves.

The Old Testament and the New are both plain and emphatical in their denunciations against oppression. "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall *surely be put to death*:" Ex. 21: 16. "Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to *loose the bands of wickedness*, to undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free?" Isa. 58: 6.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

THE laws of the great God are as binding upon men of the present day as they were upon the Israelites. And they will be binding upon men to the end of time. Slaveholders are so aware of this, that when slavery is called sinful they fly to the Bible and attempt to prove that this holy book sanctions that dreadful system of iniquity.

In these pages we intend to show that slavery is a violation of all the commandments, and that every slaveholder, who persists in holding his fellow men in bondage, after light is shed upon his conscience, will meet the wrath of God. To this end, we shall place the laws of slaveholders by the side of the laws of JEHOVAH. If they agree, we shall give up our anti-slavery doctrines; but if they disagree, and are found to be directly opposed to each other, then christianity and slavery cannot possibly be co-existent. We say then, to the LAW AND THE TESTIMONY.

I. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

This commandment forbids idolatry. An idolater is one who worships for God that which is not God. We do not mean to say that slaveholders require that their slaves shall actually pray to them; but we do mean to say that they

thrust themselves between *Jehovah* and the slave, and compel the latter, on pain of death, to obey them, whether their commands are like God's commandments, or not. Thus the slaveholder puts himself in the place of God, and says to his trembling slaves, *Thou shalt have no other gods before ME.*

The slaveholder claims the right to do what belongs only to God, to bind the conscience. Take a fact—one out of many—to illustrate this. Colonel R—— of Tennessee, learning that one of his slaves attended a prayer-meeting on the estate, told him that if he ever attended another, he would tie him up and give him one hundred lashes on his bare back.—*Anti-Slavery Record*, vol. ii. p. 59.

And who is this, we ask, that usurps the authority of *JEHOVAH*, and says, "thou shalt obey *MAN* rather than *GOD*?" Who? *THE SLAVEHOLDER*—for he claims the right of ownership in man. When God has said, "all souls are mine"—The slaveholder says, "No! I claim that man as my property. He shall not even learn to read God's law; he shall not worship him without my permission; he shall break every commandment in the decalogue, if my business or pleasure require it." Who, then, is the God to the slave? man or *Jehovah*?

II. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. . . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, &c.

This commandment forbids the setting up of any image or creature as an object of worship. Now it is as wicked to force another to break a commandment, as to break it directly ourselves. If I put a pistol into another man's hand, and compel him to shoot at another person, and kill him, I am the murderer, and not the man I used as an instrument. So if a slaveholder compels a slave to yield up his conscience to him, and forces him to "bow down" to him, as his property, he puts himself in the place of God, and requires the slave to render worship to him. Thus he breaks the second commandment. Wo to him if he repents not.

III. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless, that taketh his name in vain.

In the "Negro's soliloquy on the ten commandments," he is supposed to utter his thoughts thus in view of the third commandment. "How can me learn dat?—my massa swear,—my driver swear,—my missis swear;—all round me swear. Suppose I no swear, dey all curse me. Oh, my Lord, tell my massa, not swear so; tell my missis not to be so angry; tell my driver not lick poor negro so much;—den me stop swear. Oh Lord, forgive poor negro,—how he stop swear? dey all swear and curse poor negro so."

Is not the slaveholder answerable for the profane swearing on his plantation? If a man sells ardent spirit, or as the Rev. Dr. Hewitt, the

temperance agent, once said, "sells damnation by the quart," he is deemed answerable to God for all the wickedness those commit under the influence of the liquid poison they purchased of him. In like manner they who uphold slavery, or apologize for it, are guilty of the profaneness connected with this atrocious system.

But slaveholders are guilty of direct blasphemy. Slavery, after denying man the Bible, the Sabbath, the marriage institution, the ownership of his own body; after chaining the poor victim, tasking him unmercifully, exacting his sweat and even his blood, turns round,—and to palliate the horrid guilt,—charges God as the author of all this foul system of abominations!

IV. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and DO ALL THY WORK, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, THY MAN-SERVANT, NOR THY MAID-SERVANT, NOR THY CATTLE, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates, &c.

We make another extract from the "Negro's Soliloquy," or commentary. "Oh, massa God! when will dey let me keep holy de Sabbath day;—But no rest for poor negro,—all six days long him mus work for his massa; seven day him mus work for himself, or him's wife and him's pickaninny mus starve wid him. Massa no keep Sabbath day holy;—massa go shoot;—massa go sleep;—massa no go worship;—driver

angry,—driver flog;—Oh, Lord, my God, tell my massa give poor negro time, oder day, work for himself; so him can rest on Sabbath day. Tell massa not let driver flog poor negro so,—make him work on de holy day.”

No day is given to the slave, not even the Sabbath. Often, indeed, they work for their masters on this holy day, when tempted by a premium to break the commandment. Of almost the whole slave population it may with truth be said, “*they know no Sabbath.*” When they do hear the gospel it has very little power over their consciences. According to the testimony of the Rev. Professor Jones of the South Carolina Theological Seminary at Columbia, “they are a **NATION OF HEATHEN** *in our very midst.*”

God commands men to “remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,” and “six days shalt thou labor and do *all* thy work,” but slavery says, **SEVEN** *days shalt thou labor!* Thus God is robbed of the Sabbath, and his laws nullified by wicked men.

V. Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Children are required to *honor* their parents, which implies that it is the duty of parents to perform those parental duties, both in regard to soul and body, that are calculated to secure the obedience and respect of their children, and the favor of God. But slavery rudely and impiously

snaps asunder that cord which binds the hearts of parents and children in one. Under this hellish system family government, that beautiful arrangement by which God has produced so much happiness, is destroyed, parents having no control over their offspring, nor children being bound to obey their parents. Thus man audaciously presumes to release children from filial obligations, and to put it out of the power of parents to exercise parental love or authority.

“Honor thy father and thy mother!”—“Who dey be?” says the poor slave. “Where negro’s fader an moder? how can him honor dem?—suppose him see driver flog his fader, what can he do?—suppose him see driver throw down his moder and flog her;—she cry—she bleed; she call upon her son to help her;—negro say one word, he too be thrown down;—driver curse him—driver lick him; he go tell massa; massa lick him ’gain;—send him to driver;—driver flog him;—put him in stocks,—drive him,—lick him—may be kill him;—What for? ’cause negro tell him, not make his poor moder bleed so:—Oh Lord, tell his massa, let poor negro alone to honor his fader and moder.”

Does any slaveholder, or abettor of slavery, sneer at the simple language of the broken-hearted slave, in view of the indignities and cruelties offered his parent? In view of the yearnings of the parents over the children whom they cannot succor or relieve? *The Lord will laugh at your*

calamity, and mock when your fear cometh ; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind ; when distress and anguish cometh upon you.

VI. Thou shalt not kill.

“The sixth commandment,” says Thomas Scott, “requires us to ‘love our neighbor as ourselves,’ in respect of his *person and life.*” It “likewise prohibits us to assault, maim, or wound others, or to assist those who do it. . . . All the slaughter committed by oppressions, persecutions, or attempts to deprive of liberty, or confine in slavery, our unoffending fellow-creatures, on any pretence whatever, is artful, cruel murder.

“What then shall we think,” he says, “of the accursed slave-trade” [and he might have added, of the accursed system of slavery—the upholder of the slave-trade] “and how thankful should we be, that it is at length abolished! Even the laws needlessly sanguinary, involve the persons concerned in this enormous guilt; and they who ought to punish the murderer, and yet suffer him to escape, will be numbered among the abettors of his crime, at the tribunal of God.”

God said to Noah, “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for IN THE IMAGE OF GOD made he man;” and from Sinai He proclaimed, “Thou shalt not kill.” Yet, by the laws of the slave states, if the slave dares to resist any chastisement the master may

choose to inflict, no matter how unjust, he may be **LEGALLY SHOT THROUGH THE HEAD.**

"If any slave," in Georgia, "*shall presume to strike ANY WHITE PERSON,*" be it in defence of chastity or life, of parent, wife, or child, "he shall, for the first offence, suffer such punishment as the justice or justices shall, in their discretion, think fit, not extending to life or limb; and for the second offence, suffer **DEATH.**"

In Virginia, there are **SEVENTY-ONE** offences for which the penalty is *death* when committed by *slaves*, and imprisonment (merely) "when by whites." And as no slave can be a party in any species of action against his master, or any white person be capitally convicted on the testimony of slaves, before a judicial tribunal, even in case of known and malicious murder of a slave by a white person, the murderer usually escapes. Such is the slave code! Is it not in direct opposition to the law of God? And yet these are the laws for which is claimed the sanction of **JEHOVAH.** They give the master *absolute power of life and death* over his slave. Slavery first seizes upon the slave by brutal violence, and then to palliate the guilt of **ROBBERY** and **MURDER**, legalizes them!!

In heathen nations, infanticide or the murder of little children by their parents, always prevails, and in slave states (those regions of heathenism) this crime is not unusual. Who are the guilty

cause of the deaths of those innocents? **SLAVE-HOLDERS.** Suicides prevail among slaves. Sir Michael Clare, M. D., in his evidence before a committee of the British House of Lords, said, that "on one occasion, eleven slaves committed suicide. One hung the other ten." Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad; much more the unlearned. And such madness drives the desperate and goaded slave to self-murder. Upon whose skirts will be found his blood?

Rev. John Wesley, in addressing slave-traders and slaveholders, says, "you induce the villain to steal, rob, murder men, women and children, without number, by paying him for his execrable labor. It is all your act and deed. This equally concerns all slaveholders, of whatever rank or degree; seeing men-buyers are exactly on a level with men-stealers! Indeed, you say, 'I pay honestly for my goods; and I am not concerned to know how they are come by.' Nay, but you are; otherwise you are partaker with a thief, and are not a jot honestier than he. But you know that they are not honestly come by; you know they are procured by means nothing near so innocent as picking pockets, house-breaking, or robbery upon the highway. You know they are procured by a deliberate species of more complicated villainy, of fraud, robbery and murder, than was ever practised by Mahomedans or Pagans.

"Perhaps you will say,—'I do not buy any

slaves ; I only use those left me by my father.' But is that enough to satisfy your conscience ? Had your father have you, has any man living a right to use another as a slave ? It cannot be, even setting revelation aside.

" The blood of thy brother crieth against thee from the earth. Oh, whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry, before it be too late ; instantly, at any price, were it the half of your goods ; deliver thyself from blood-guiltiness. Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house and thy lands, at present, are stained with BLOOD."

VII. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

The marriage of one man with one woman was the original institution of the Creator, and by the decisions of Christ, polygamy, or more wives than one, and divorces, are utterly incompatible with the law of God. What usage has slavery introduced and perpetuated ? **PROMISCUOUS CONCUBINAGE.**

This is the distinguishing characteristic of slavery. Slavery then is poisoning the fountain of good morals in this land, and producing a reckless disregard of all laws, human and divine.

Slave laws do not recognise marriages among slaves, so as to clothe them with the rights and immunities, which are given to this state, among white citizens. The holder of either party may, the next day, or hour, break up the connexion in any way he pleases. In fact, these connexions have no protection, and are so often broken up

by sales, and transfers, and removals, that they are, by the slaves, usually called "taking up together."

The female slaves are entirely dependent on their masters, and subject to insult from any white man. The overseers are not generally married men. They are often refused employment, simply because they are married. Married men meet with general discouragement from the planters. If the slave is taught morality, as he rarely is, he can point to his master and say, "You tell me to do so and so, but what do you do yourself?"

Slaveholders often prohibit their slaves from marrying. "I will not allow you to get married, you may live as I am living myself." And slaves often will not marry, when permitted, because they cannot endure to have their wedded wives flogged.

J. Ballie, Esq. testified, before a committee of the House of Lords, that he could not name one friend, or any overseer or other person, in the West Indies who did not keep a black or colored mistress. Slavery is every where the same as to this matter. According to the testimony of Rev. James A. Thome of Ky., "The slave states are Sodoms, and almost every kitchen is a brothel." And the "Western Luminary," printed at Lexington, Ky., stated the same, in substance, the very day Mr. Thome made the remark in a speech in New York.

In Jamaica, it was stated, that three-fourths of the adults are united in giving honor to seduction and impurity, over "marriage" and the "bed undefiled." The extent of the influence on the tone of morals, can hardly be estimated; but we may fairly attribute to it the almost total absence of any thing like morality among the people. Sabbath-breaking, blasphemy, infidelity, alienation from God, extortion, covetousness, stripes, contentions, cruelties, pervade the length and breadth of the land: for the habitual and wilful breach of one of God's laws, especially of the seventh commandment, overturns the barrier of the whole.

VIII. Thou shalt not steal.

"This commandment is," says Dr. Scott, "the law of love in respect of *property*." "The spirit of it requires a disposition to do to *all* others, in respect of worldly property, as we would that they should do unto us." It pre-supposes and assumes the right of every man to his own powers, and their product. Slavery denies the right, and robs of both. This commandment forbids the taking of *any*, even the least part of that which belongs to another. Slavery takes away the *whole*.

In the larger catechism of the Presbyterian Church, the question is asked, "What are the sins forbidden in the eighth commandment? And *man-stealing* is mentioned as one. "To steal a man," says Grotius, "is the *highest kind of*

theft." Who are stealers of men? those foreign pirates that kidnap or buy men on the coast of Africa, or those domestic pirates that kidnap or buy men in America? I answer BOTH. "*Stealers of men,*" says the same learned writer, "*are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and KEEP, SELL, or BUY them.*"

"Men-stealers," observes Dr. Scott, "are inserted among those daring criminals, against whom the law of God directed its curses. These kidnapped men to sell them for slaves; and this practice seems inseparable from the other iniquities and oppressions of slavery; nor can a slave-dealer keep free from this criminality, if '*the receiver be AS BAD AS THE THIEF.*'"

God says, "*thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him.*" Lev. xix, 13. Again,—"*Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. . . Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.*" James v, 1, 4. And again, "*Wo unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages.*" Jer. xxii, 13. And, "*he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.*" Ex. xxi, 16.

IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*

The ninth commandment is the law of love,

as it respects our neighbor's *reputation*. And God has here thrown a barrier around *man's character*, to protect it from injury. Yet slavery, not only slanders the characters of its victims, but belies the whole colored race. It also by denying self-evident truths in philosophy, and the plain declarations of the Bible, slanders wise men, and also what is more, the all-wise God.

But slavery gives the lie to the sages who signed the Declaration of Independence, by declaring that the negro has no right to "liberty" and the "pursuit of happiness."

God declares that he has made of "ONE BLOOD all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," but slavery denies that the colored man is naturally equal to the whites. God asserts that he is "*no respecter of persons*," but slavery pretends that the negro was intended by his maker to be a slave to the rest of the world.

Slavery strips man of his rights, ranks him with brutes, and then pleads his *native inferiority*. It does more, it lays its iron grasp upon the immortal mind, crushes its opening faculties, and then wickedly attempts to apologise for the outrage by pleading the colored man's unsuitness for freedom, his native inferiority, and his subjection to slavery by the common Father of all mankind. What is this but *bearing false witness* against both man and God?

X. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his*

man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

This prohibition is placed as the fence around all the rest of the commandments. The others prohibit the outward gross crime, but this, in the most forcible language, prohibits so much as the *desire or hankering* after what belongs to others. If we may not covet any thing that is our neighbor's how canst thou pretend to be the *owner* of thy neighbor himself? "Thou shalt not covet," says God, and the slaveholder, in the face of the prohibition, holds ten, fifty, a hundred, or a thousand of his *neighbors* as mere "chattels personal," under an overseer whose business it is to get out of them as much work as he can, *without paying for it*. Every hour of the slave's labor is coveted, every blow he strikes is coveted; if it were not so, he would be free. Here then we see that the tenth commandment cuts up the whole system of American slavery, root and branch.

Servants, it is argued, were enumerated in the inventory of property. Hence it is inferred that servants were the property of their masters. They were included among houses, oxen, asses, &c. But if that makes them property, it proves also that *wives* were property.

The slaveholder covets his neighbor's liberty, and withholds it from him; he covets his neighbor's services, and compels him to work without wages; he covets his neighbor's wife, sells her

into the hands of another, or subjects her to insult, to gratify his lust; he covets his neighbor's children, and hence he *enslaves*, and sometimes sells them and tears them from their parents' embrace for ever. Thus man tramples upon the rights of his fellow-men, in contempt of the law of God, and practises the sin of IDOLATRY,* "*for which thing's sake*," says the apostle, "*the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.*"

The *eighth* and *tenth* commandments, were there no others, brand slavery as a sin, and deal death to the system. The *eighth* forbids the taking away, and the *tenth* adds, *Thou shalt not COVET any thing that is thy neighbor's;*" thus guarding every man's right to himself and his property, by making not only the actual *taking away* a sin, but even that state of mind which would *tempt* to such an act.

Reader! Forget not the awful sanctions that God has thrown around His moral law; remember that by them you will be judged at the bar of Jesus Christ; and devoutly pray, "Lord have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws upon our hearts."

* "And covetousness, which is idolatry." Col. iii, 5

Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society,
Office, 143 Nassau street, New York.

DANGER AND SAFETY.

SLAVERY—DANGEROUS ; EMANCIPATION—SAFE.

IN this little tract we propose to show, *from authentic documents and unquestionable authority*, that slavery is a system full of peril, and that immediate emancipation is, in all respects, safe.

A few years ago the editor of the Richmond Enquirer said, "We had forbore to touch the subject for twenty-seven years. * * * The press broke the silence of fifty years." He then quotes approvingly the language of a South Carolinian, just returned from the North, who says; "We may shut our eyes if we please, but there is the dark and growing evil at our doors. Of this I am very sure, that the difference, nothing short of *frightful*, between all on one side of the Potomac, and all on the other, is owing to that cause *alone*. The disease is at our heart's core, it has all along been CONSUMING OUR VITALS. What is to be done? Oh! my God, I don't know, but SOMETHING MUST BE DONE:" and the editor adds: "Means must be adopted for reducing the MASS OF EVIL, which is pressing upon the South."

The Richmond Whig said: "We did not, could not, DARE to breathe a syllable on a subject *ever nearest our hearts*, and of TRANSCENDENT MOMENT to the country." In the same article,

the editor says: "In our estimation, **ALL OTHER QUESTIONS** which have engaged the attention of the people of Virginia, since the Revolution, are by the side of this comparatively *insignificant*. War embraces in its ruin a few only; **SLAVERY**, in its *moral* consequences, extends its **CURSE TO EVERY INDIVIDUAL** of the state where it exists. War is temporary—slavery **MULTIPLIES ITS EVILS** and increases the probability of its perpetuation, **IN EVERY INSTANT** of time it is tolerated. There can be no question embracing such multitudes in its decision, for weal or for wo, and reaching in its effects so far down the stream of time. Not Virginia only is interested, not whether her sons shall be relieved of the *reproach*, the **AWFUL** and **INCALCULABLE OPPRESSION**, and the piecemeal **POLITICAL DEATH** of slavery. But the question * * comprehends all the southern states, and all the inhabitants, and not the living only, but all succeeding generations."

Mr. Broadnax, in the Virginia Legislature, said: "Life became a burden, and it were better to seek a home in some distant realm, than *endure* so precarious a condition."

Mr. Moore, another member, spoke of "the curse of slavery," its "monstrous consequences," its "**IRRESISTABLE TENDENCY TO DESTROY EVERY THING LIKE VIRTUE AND MORALITY** in the community," and said; the slaves "being restrained by no moral or patriotic considerations,

will *ever* be ready to *act as guides to an invading foe*, and to *flock to his standard*, whenever he may tempt them to it, by the STRONGEST TEMPTATION which can EVER be presented—the possession of LIBERTY.” He considered the following conclusion “OBVIOUS.” “It is, that, *at no distant day*, we shall be involved in a servile war, which will not end till the land shall EVERYWHERE BE RED WITH HUMAN BLOOD.”

Volumes might be filled with the language of slaveholders, fully confirming the following graphic description, written by a gentleman who had resided and travelled much at the South.

“The influences of slavery upon slaveholders and the slave states, are, an abiding sense of insecurity and dread—the press cowering under a censorship—freedom of speech struck dumb by proscription—a standing army of patrols to awe down insurrection—the mechanic arts and all vigorous enterprise crushed under an incubus—a thriftless agriculture smiting the land with barrenness and decay—industry held up to scorn, and idleness a badge of dignity.”

Mr. Moore, the Virginia legislator, said, in the speech before referred to; “I think that slavery, as it exists among us, may be regarded as the HEAVIEST CALAMITY which has ever befallen *any portion of the human race*.”

Can emancipation be worse!

In 1822, a portion of the slaveholders in the

West Indies addressed the British House of Commons in the following language: "The alarming and unprecedented state of *distress* in which the whole British West India interest is at this time involved, justifies them in imploring parliament to adopt prompt and effectual measures of relief, in order to preserve them from INEVITABLE RUIN."

In view of the horrors of slavery, emancipation (the only remedy adequate to cure the evil) has been looked upon by slaveholders with dread, and *immediate emancipation* with feelings little short of dismay. Even many, in the free States, who abhor slavery, have, without due examination, looked upon this remedy as worse than the disease. Let the FACTS now presented be duly considered, and we venture to predict that such apprehensions will be entirely dissipated. The inhabitants of the free States not only, but slaveholders, must acknowledge that immediate emancipation will ensure the welfare and happiness of all concerned.

The following are some of the cases of emancipation for the last fifty years. In St. Domingo, Cayenne, Guadaloupe, and Martinique, in 1794; in Java, 1811; in Ceylon, 1815; in Buenos Ayres, 1816; in St. Helena, 1819; in Colombia and Chili, 1821; in Cape Colony, 1823; in Malacca, 1825; in the southern provinces of Burmah and in Bolivia, 1826; in Peru, Guatemala, and Monte Video, 1828; in twenty pro-

vinces by the British government, Aug. 1, 1834. As this last case has special claims upon attention, we will pass over the others, simply remarking, that though slavery produced many insurrections in those countries, *not one* has resulted from emancipation. In the oft-cited case of St. Domingo, the French historian testified, that after emancipation, "The colony marched as by enchantment towards its ancient splendor; cultivation prospered; every day produced perceptible proofs of its progress." It was an attempt to re-enslave freemen that produced the "Horrors of St. Domingo," to which the enemies of emancipation so triumphantly refer.*

William R. Hayes, a lawyer from Vermont, well known to many in this country as an unimpeachable witness, in a letter to Gerrit Smith, dated Sept. 20, 1836, gives the following des-

* After emancipation, Toussaint L'Ouverture, who had been a slave, was appointed governor of the French part of the island. Col. Molenfant says: "The colony flourished under Toussaint. The whites lived happily and in *peace* upon their estates, and the negroes continued to work for them." Albert de Lattre, a paymaster in the army sent to restore slavery, and of course, bitterly opposed to Toussaint, in a book published in France, in 1804, says: "The majority of the inhabitants of the towns, (the former slaveholders,) loved the government of Toussaint, because he had **GORGED THEM WITH RICHES.**" What a testimony to the consequences of emancipation, being wrung out, as it was, from the lips of an open opponent!

cription of the “consequences” of emancipation as he witnessed them.

“I went to Trinidad in Nov. 1834; I had heard, at home, of the persevering opposition which emancipation had met with in the islands, and I naturally supposed it would be necessary to be very guarded in my remarks about it. I therefore kept very still, thinking that even a few words might occasion a tumult, as I had been taught to believe, the liberated negroes only wanted an occasion to rise and murder all the whites. I soon found no alarm was felt, people speaking as freely about emancipation as of any thing else. All the negroes appeared cheerful and harmless, and not seldom did I hear the remark, even from planters, that emancipation was a great blessing! *The scales fell from my eyes!* I found that all the predictions I had heard of massacres, insurrections, &c, &c, were no better than nursery tales. Indeed, it was plain to be seen that emancipation had been the very thing to take away, *at once and forever*, all danger of violence on the part of the colored people. I afterwards visited Grenada and St. Vincent. The same may be said of them as of Trinidad. I have resided on this island, [Barbadoes,] (with the exception of a visit at home last winter) constantly since January, 1835. The town contains, say 40,000 inhabitants, and the island 130,000, of whom not more than 20,000 are whites. On the first of August, 1834, the number

of slaves liberated was something over 80,000. What a place for the exhibition of that ferocity which, we are told, exists in the breast of the African! Now I venture to declare that since the 1st of August, 1834, there has not been the slightest popular disturbance, or even the rumor of one, in any part of the island. And this is not because the blacks are overawed. They are themselves a part of the island militia, and are as orderly and as little inclined to violence as any people on earth.

“The general sentiment in this island, I believe to be now in favor of emancipation, as three years ago it was opposed to it. It has done my heart good to hear people of the highest standing here, and those who owned great numbers of slaves, freely admit that their *opposition to emancipation was all wrong*—that it was one of the greatest blessings that ever came upon the country, and that **NOTHING WOULD INDUCE THEM TO RETURN TO SLAVERY**. When I read of the fears of the people in America, in regard to emancipation; of the prejudice against color, and of the way in which they declare against abolition, as something that is going to open the floodgates of war and disunion, my wonder is only second to that which I feel when I reflect upon what were once my own feelings upon these same subjects. If all the opposers of abolition in the United States, including slaveholders themselves, could spend six months, in any part

of the British West Indies, abolition societies might dissolve themselves at once—their occupation would be gone.

“The alarm which was felt in the West Indies, as to a general depreciation of property and stagnation of buisness, has proved quite groundless.* The Islands have rarely if ever been so prosperous as at present, and in this Island, I think I may safely say, there have been more improvements in buildings, agriculture, &c, in the last two years than in any preceding two years. Comfort and happiness have increased, education and religious knowledge been promoted, and public morals greatly improved.

“When I look at this country, and witness the *blessed changes* which have been brought about by emancipation, and when I contemplate my own country, straining every nerve to maintain a system, so fraught with evil as slavery, my heart is full. Slavery in the West Indies, as every where else, has always stood in the way of the progress of Christianity. Hence the continually repeated complaints against the missionaries in all the Islands. Slavery and Christianity were pitted against each other, the one imploring secrecy and darkness; the other demanding light.

* Official returns of exports, in 1835, showed an increase in the first quarter of that year over the average of the first quarter of the three preceding years, of 20 per cent from Georgetown, (Demerara,) and 50 per cent from Berbice.

Mark now the difference. In this Island, numerous parish churches which have been in ruins since the hurricane of 1831, are rising from their ruins. The Methodist missionaries are extending their stations, and multiplying their preachers and assistants in every direction. The Moravians have just finished a fine new chapel.

“I might say much of the prodigious increase of schools. In this respect the change is just what we should expect it to be, great and truly gratifying to every benevolent mind.

“There is one other subject, which I think bears strongly upon the policy of the American Colonization Society. I believe the main pillar of that society at the North is the idea that the blacks cannot live in peace and on terms of equality in the same community with the whites. How mistaken this idea is, may I think appear by what is now going on in the West Indies. And here let it be remembered, that the people of this country have entertained the very same prejudices against color that now prevail in the United States. The colony of Demerara is comparatively new, and there is a great call for laborers to subdue and bring under cultivation that great and fertile territory.—(I may here remark that Demerara was on all hands, said to be entirely ruined by emancipation, but see how false the notion.) The same thing there is now taking place, as we in America have always been accustomed to see, viz: emigration from

the old colonies to the new. In this way Demerara is to be supplied with an abundance of free laborers, and thereby immensely benefited. A supply which but for emancipation, she could never have obtained in any way short of a revival of the African slavetrade. But that which I wish to have particularly remarked is this: The legislature of St. Kitts, and more recently, of this island, have become alarmed at the number of emigrants who are leaving them, all of whom are black, and have passed various laws to restrain it, openly and avowedly with the purpose of keeping their laborers among them! The policy of these laws is condemned by many here, who contend that labor must be left to find its own market, and a discussion is now actually going on in the newspapers, one party insisting that there must be laws to check emigration, and the other contending that the object may be more effectually accomplished by raising the wages, providing better houses for their laborers, &c. The whole dispute being *how they shall best be able to keep among them their liberated slaves!*

“That very thing which the colonizationists of America, are spending their strength and wealth to bring about—the people of the West Indies are laboring with all their might to *prevent*. On the one side we hear the cry, “Begone from among us, for we cannot tolerate your existence here, as a free people” on the other, “Leave us not, we beseech you, we will build you houses,

we will clothe and feed you, we will pay you good wages, only leave us not." Be it remembered, too, that the pretended necessity for the exportation of the blacks from the United States, has a *theoretical* foundation only, whereas the people of this country are acting from a thorough *experience*, both of slavery and emancipation.

"I spent last evening at an estate about four miles from town. It is one of the finest properties in the island, and the resident manager is reputed to be one of the most skilful planters in the country. Such is the character of the estate, that when the French Admiral visited the island last year, the governor made a visit with him for the especial purpose of showing a specimen of Barbadoes cultivation, and sugar manufacture.

"The conversation turned upon emancipation, and, sir, I assure you, it was enough to affect the stoutest heart, to hear the expressions of gratitude and satisfaction with which the new order of things was spoken of.

"As we walked along the noble gallery which surrounds the house, he pointed to a large building filled with lights, situated on a distant elevation, and observed, "there is good work going on; these are the Moravians with their schools for the liberated slaves." From all the members of the family similar language was heard, and especially when they spoke of the comparative comforts of living on an estate now, and during the existence of slavery. Now, there is a feeling

of *perfect security*, a sentiment of kindness and mutual good will, whereas formerly there was distrust, jealousy, and the idea, which never could be perfectly eradicated from the breasts even of hereditary slaveholders—that it was a gross injustice to take the labor of the poor negroes without compensation. In regard to the industry of the people, the manager observed that it was enough to say that *the estate had never been in such a high state of cultivation as at present*.

“In the United States a common topic of remark, is the insolence of the colored people.

“Abolitionists are charged with being the abettors of this insolence—and we are generally told that unless the blacks are kept under, they will come to such a state of insubordination that white people cannot live with them. Now, sir, I believe you will fully agree with me, that this *keeping them under* is the very thing which occasions all the difficulty. Kick a dog and he will snarl, and perhaps bite you—speak kindly to him and he is your friend.

“My store is situated on the wharf, amidst a very dense population—swarming with black porters, boatmen, sailors, &c, and these people are entitled to all the privileges and possessed of all the rights of freedom that I am, or any other white man. I am dealing with these people more or less every day, and I have been trying to recollect whether in all my residence

here I have ever received an impudent word from one of them.—Possibly I may have done so, but if I have, it has escaped my memory.”

Let us now turn our eyes to ANTIGUA. On this island there were, before August 1, 1834, no less than 30,000 slaves to 2000 whites. The local legislature accepted the compensation bounty of the British government, declined availing themselves of the apprenticeship system, and, on that day, gave entire liberty to all the slaves. We give a specimen of the results:—

A member of the British Parliament for Lymington, stated, that having for nine years before emancipation, possessed the largest slave property in Antigua, he had lost by it not less than £7000, (\$35,000,) but since the period in question, had let his estate for £1200 (\$6000) a year, for three years, upon unexceptionable security, and after the three years, for £1500 (\$7500) a year, and, moreover, since he had concluded this bargain, he had been offered £2000, (\$10,000.)

The reader is referred to the Anti-Slavery Record, Vol II, No. 11, for a selection from the official reports to the British Parliament. The following from the despatch of Sir James Carmichael Smyth, Governor of British Guiana, dated March 4th, 1835, is a specimen. “Since the 1st of August, there has not been an instance of a white man being struck or ill treated by a negro.”

In the same document, he describes the enthusiasm with which the emancipated slaves labored to defend their masters' property from harm.

In the British House of Lords, Nov. 23, 1837, Lord Brougham said of Antigua, that, "property in that island had risen in value—offences of all sorts, from capital offences downwards, had decreased, as appeared from returns sent to the governor of that colony, and the exports of sugar had increased. During the three years ending 1834, the average yearly export was 165,000*cwts.* and for the three subsequent years, this average had increased to 189,000*cwts.* being an increase of 24,000*cwts.* or one clear seventh. Nor were the last three years productive seasons, for in 1835 there was a very severe and destructive hurricane, and in 1836 there was such a drought that water was obliged to be imported from Barbadoes."

During the year 1837, JOSEPH STURGE, THOMAS HARVEY, DR. LLOYD and JOHN SCOBLE, of England, went to the West Indies, at their own charges, for the express purpose of examining into the condition of the partially emancipated slaves (the apprentices) in the different islands, and the condition of the 30,000 recent slaves, but now colored FREEMEN of Antigua. Messrs. Sturge and Harvey have published the results of their investigation in a handsome volume, and spread before the British public the all-important facts contained in it. Joseph Sturge

is an eminent merchant of Birmingham, son-in-law to the well-known JAMES CROPPER, of Liverpool, and his character stands very high in England. The other gentlemen are also persons of much respectability. Their statements, therefore, may be implicitly relied upon:—

“James Cox, the superintendant of the Wesleyan Mission, (at Antigua,) told us that he thought the most sanguine expectation of abolitionists had been realized. *He did not think there was a man in the island who would be willing to return to slavery.*”

“At first the proprietors apprehended evils from the Emancipation Act, but a persuasion, however, of the superiority of the free system gained ground in future discussions, and now, *the most bigoted adherents of slavery acknowledge that free labor is best and cheapest.*”

“Previously to the abolition of slavery, the market was principally supplied by the agricultural peasantry, with articles of their own raising; but now this class are more generally buyers than sellers; and a large proportion of the merchandize is of foreign growth or manufacture. *The increase of trade thus created is one consequence of the payment of labor in wages.*”

“On the average of estates, Mr. Morrish did not think that the free system was dearer than slavery. Another planter, when we called upon him, told us that the people gave him much less trouble than before emancipation. He mention-

ed one estate in the island (Antigua) which had netted £5000 sterling this year.

“We went to see a part of the Mission property, which had been let off in little plots to laborers on adjoining estates, who esteem it a privilege to tenant them, though they receive no equivalent increase of wages in lieu of the hut and ground which they would otherwise occupy on the estate. One boy of fifteen, who has an aged mother to support, applied for a piece of land, and, when the Minister hesitated, said, ‘O, massa, I can manage to pay the rent.’ He immediately set about clearing it with great spirit, and has now got it into nice order, and part of it planted with grain.

“We went to the school-room, where we found the teacher engaged with three or four negroes, whom he teaches to write on the Saturday. They were fine, intelligent men. One of them told us, that notwithstanding the hard times and dearness of provisions, ‘he praised God every day for freedom.’ He and his brother had to maintain their aged mother.

“Dr. Nugent states that a purchasing and consuming population is beginning to be formed within the island itself. The sale of ground-provisions to their laborers is already become a source of profit to estates.

“The estate hospitals have become useless. On a Monday morning, during slavery, the doctor would find eight, ten or even twenty in

the sick-house. Now, he has comparatively nothing to do.

“With regard to the general welfare of the colony, he told us that the proprietary body are more prosperous than before. Some estates have thrown off their load of debt, others have passed into the possession of capitalists, by whom their cultivation can be more effectively carried on. An estate was mentioned which cost, ten years ago, forty thousand pounds. *He (Dr. Nugent) would give as much for this very estate now without the slaves, and considered it a safer and a better investment.*

“Another small estate was instanced, belonging to three equal proprietors. Just before emancipation, two of them sold their shares for one thousand five hundred pounds currency each; the third man stands out for more, one proof, amongst many, that property has risen in value.

“An English firm, who before emancipation, were seeking to reduce their securities on estates as much as possible, have since sent out an agent to Antigua, to see if there were any openings to extend them.

“It is due to Dr. Nugent to state, that the whip was disused on the estate on which he resides during the last fifteen years of slavery; one consequence of which humane system is seen in the fact, that only one of the negroes has left the estate since they became free.

“The people are much more easily and pleasantly governed than during slavery. Dr. N. said, ‘he did not believe there was a man in the colony who could lay his hand upon his heart and say, he would wish to return to the old state of things.’

“Our host assured us, that his people worked *more regularly* than during slavery.

“The attention of the people (the emancipated negroes) to the cultivation of their own grounds is a striking proof of their industry and settled habits. Their cottages have been also generally enclosed by neat fences since 1834; and the whole conduct of the people exhibits as much stability, as though their leaving the estate was as unlikely to happen as during slavery, when it was nearly an impossible event.

“Before returning to town, we visited another estate in the same neighborhood, from whose intelligent manager we received accounts equally satisfactory of the favorable effects of freedom. The managers of these two estates were both friendly to emancipation, yet they assured us in strong terms that the *measure had succeeded far beyond their utmost expectations.*

“One of them said, ‘the proprietary body must, with some exceptions, be bettered by the change, allowing the rise in sugar its proper influence. Their credit is better, their capital at stake less; their personal responsibility also less; their properties are increased in value;

their management and appropriation more free and uncontrolled. Bankruptcy was written on us in legible characters as an island; and most of the estates must have inevitably passed into the possession of the merchants.'

"One of the most worthless women on the property, (Mackinnon's estate) and always pretending sickness and inability to work, had become as industrious a laborer as any on the estate. The planter asked her on one occasion the reason of the change in her habits. She replied, significantly, 'Me get no money then, massa.'

"We visited an estate about twelve miles distant from St. John's, in the district called Bermudian Valley. It was purchased by two gentlemen immediately after the 1st of August, 1834; and though a losing concern to its former proprietor, *now yields, as we were informed by one of the present owners, a liberal profit per annum clear of expenses and interest.*

"One of us called this morning, the 12th Dec. upon the Hon. Samuel Warner, President of the council, whose testimony, like that of the Speaker, was decidedly favorable to the results of the emancipation.

"We called on the 15th upon the Governor to take leave, &c. He mentioned to us, that a gentleman, who was a proprietor, and also attorney for sixteen estates, and who had been strongly opposed to emancipation, had lately

told him that *he was at length satisfied with the change, and would be sorry to return to the slave system.*

“Our opportunities of personal observation were extensive. We had also the privilege of free communication with the most intelligent and influential persons in the colony.—*There is one subject upon which all are agreed—that the great experiment of abolition has succeeded beyond the expectations of its most sanguine advocates.* The measure has been felt to be one of emancipation of masters, as well as slaves. The annual cost of cultivation is believed, by the most intelligent resident planters, to be on the average, one-fifth or one-sixth less than formerly; so that free labor is manifestly advantageous, taking even the narrowest view of the subject. There has been an augmentation of the import trade of the island. Houses and lands have risen in value, *estates are now worth as much as they were, with the slaves attached to them, before the alleged depreciation in their value in consequence of the agitation of the abolition question.* The cultivation of one estate, which had been thrown up for twenty years, and of others which were on the point of being abandoned, has been resumed. *The few sold since 1834 have been eagerly bought up at very high prices.*

“The advantages which the laborers have derived from emancipation are numerous and com-

plete enough to call for devout gratitude, on their behalf, from all who are interested in the progress of human happiness. The *exuriæ* of slavery still hang about them, as well as their masters, but they possess now the capacity of elevating themselves in the scale of being; and they have means in their own power of escaping from oppression, by the choice of masters.

“In the first year (after emancipation) caprice was frequently manifested on the one hand, and a love of oppression on the other; *but in this, the third year of freedom, the records of the police courts show that both have materially decreased.*

“The Sabbath is more strictly observed in Antigua than in England, and the attendance on public worship very exemplary.”

“It may undoubtedly be calculated, that the result of a statistical comparison of the effect of the *abolition* of slavery, upon population, would be favorable, as the negroes are confessedly more careful of their health, and far less frequently require medical aid, than during slavery.

“The amount of imports of dry goods has increased; so also has the import of rice, flour, mackarel, and dried codfish. From the preceding, and from much other testimony to the same effect, we learn that there has been a general increase of import trade.

“Since the emancipation there had been a drought of great severity, and of eighteen months

duration, so that the planters have not derived all those benefits which might have been expected to result from emancipation in a period of agricultural prosperity. This severe visitation has, however, pressed far less heavily upon them than if it had occurred before 1834. The fact of this remarkable drought has been used by the friends of slavery, in the West Indies and elsewhere, as an argument against emancipation. But during slavery, a general failure both of the crops of sugar and provisions, in successive seasons, occurring, as that has done, simultaneously with the scarcity and excessive prices of those imported supplies from British America on which the island depends, *would have given the final blow to the embarrassed fortunes of a majority of the planters.*

“The cultivation of the greater number of estates is carried on at a less expense than during slavery.

“The manager of one estate, states ‘equally good crops are made with free labor. The work is also much more forward. The cultivation of provisions has decreased, that of canes increased. I have been prevented, by a great deal of building, from putting another piece of land in canes.

“‘During slavery,’ our informant adds, ‘we had *three coopers*, who never did supply the estate with hogsheads. We used to hire others on the Saturdays to make them at *four shillings* each. We purchased all our puncheons for molasses

and rum, ready made. We have now *two coopers* who make all the hogsheads and punch-
eons we want, at *two shillings* each.’

“There is a more general attendance on the means of grace than during slavery; and there is a manifest improvement in the morals of children.

“The total number of children under the instruction of the United Brethren is about two thousand five hundred; of whom about two thousand two hundred are children of slaves, liberated on the 1st of August 1834. The children’s capacities to learn are equal to those of any other class of people. They excel in reading, and the girls in needlework. Five colored persons are employed at present as teachers.”

In addition to all the preceding testimony, we have the evidence of JOSEPH H. KIMBALL, of New Hampshire, and JAMES A. THOME, of Kentucky, who visited the West Indies in 1837, and whose “Six Months Tour in Antigua, Barbadoes and Jamaica,” is now in the press.* It contains the copious testimony of those who had opposed emancipation, until it occurred, but are now free to own that it has been a blessing, because, as they agree in saying:

1. Free labor is *less expensive*.

* It will contain 450 pages 12mo. neatly printed, and be for sale at the American Anti-Slavery Office, and the Anti-Slavery Depositories throughout the country.

2. It is less *trouble* to manage free laborers than slaves.

3. Emancipation has rid the master of a species of property which was very precarious.

4. It has removed *all danger of insurrection, conflagration, and conspiracies.*

The governor of Antigua said: "The planters *all* conceded that emancipation had been a great blessing, and he did not know of a *single* individual who wished to return to the old system."

The planters, instead of seeking concealment, were very frank, assuring their visitors that "the more thorough their knowledge of facts, the more perfect would be their confidence in the safety of IMMEDIATE emancipation."

"Dr. Nugent said, 'when we saw that abolition was *inevitable*, we began to inquire what would be the safest course for getting rid of slavery. *We wished,*' said he, '*to let ourselves down in the easiest manner possible—WHEREFORE WE CHOSE IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION!*'"

Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society,
Office, 143 Nassau street, New York.

PRO-SLAVERY BIBLE.

CHAPTER I.

1. "He that stealeth a man," *except* he has African blood in him, "and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand," *except* the laws forbid emancipation, "he shall surely be put to death."

2. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," *except* when slaveholders enact, that a slave "owes to his master and to all his family a respect without bounds, and an absolute obedience." See *Law of Louisiana*.

3. "For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him," *unless* he is a slaveholder,

4. "Deliver the poor and needy; rid them out of the hand of the wicked," *except* some ecclesiastical body advise you "wholly to refrain."

5. "The Lord executeth righteousness and judgement for all that are oppressed," *except* slaves and colored people.

6. "He that despiseth his neighbor," *except* he has a colored skin, "sinneth."

7. "Rob not the poor," *except* they are black, "because he is poor—for the Lord will plead their cause, and spoil the soul of those that spoiled them," *except* they are slaveholders.

8. "Open thy mouth for the dumb," *except*

they are slaves: "plead the cause of the poor and needy," only don't "desecrate the holy Sabbath" by doing so on that day.

9. "So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun," *except* in the slaveholding states.

10. "Relieve the oppressed," *except* they are slaves.

11. "For they shall cry unto the Lord, because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a Saviour and he shall deliver them," *if* the slaveholders will let him.

12. "He that despiseth the gain of oppression" is a great fanatic.

13. "Cry aloud," [not against slaveholding,] "spare not" [the abolitionist;] "lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people" [except they are members of *our* church] "their transgressions and their sins," *except* they are slaveholders.

14. "Is not this the fast I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness," when the laws of the state will let you, "to undo the heavy burdens," if slaveholders don't oppose it; "and let the oppressed go free," *except* they are slaves, "and that ye break every yoke," *except* it is *inexpedient*.

15. "Thus saith the Lord, execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor," *except* he is a **slaveholder**.

16. "Wo unto him that useth his neighbor's services without wages," unless he first make a slave of him.

17. "Search the scriptures," if slaveholders will let you: not without.

18. "What God has joined, let no man put asunder," *except* slaveholders; they may part husbands and wives at pleasure.

19. "Ye know that they which are accounted, to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so it shall not be among you," *except* you are owners of slaves, or slave drivers.

20. "Ye devour widows' houses"—"therefore ye shall receive greater damnation," *except* ye are slaveholders.

21. "Let every man have his own wife," *except* he is a slave, "and every woman her own husband," *except* she is a slave.

22. "Wives submit to your own husbands," *except* you are slaves; in that case you must "*submit to any white man*," or you may "receive thirty lashes on" the "bare back well laid on:" or if you "shall assault and strike such white person" you "*may be lawfully killed.*"*

23. Keep thyself pure," *except* you are a slave and *white* men choose to defile you.

24. Parents bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," *except* they are slaves; then bring them up for the market.

* See Laws of Kentucky, S. Carolina and Georgia.

25. Children obey your parents," unless slaveholders forbid it.

26. "Preach the gospel to every creature," *if* slaveholders will let you.

27. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," *except* where slaveholders choose not to have any.

28. He that will not work neither shall he eat," unless he is a slaveholder.

29. "Honor all men," *except* colored people and abolitionists.

30. "Render to all their dues," *except* slaves.

31. "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal," *except* they are slaves.

32. "Forbearing threatening," *except* you are slaveholders, or slave drivers, then you could not keep up your "domestic institutions" without.

33. "The law is made for men-stealers," and not for those who inherit stolen men, and *baby* stealers; for then it would condemn "Dr. Capers, Dr. Pierce, and Dr. Olion,* and all those 'Patriarchal slaveholders,' who enslave the babies born on their plantations.

34. "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Behold the hire

* Bp. H. affirmed at the N. E. Conference that Drs. Capers, Pierce, and Olion, were slaveholders.—Ed.

of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth."

Such is the *practical* reading of the bible by pro-slavery men. Thus do they derive comfort and encouragement in approving or apologizing for a system of iniquity. With all the foregoing texts before their eyes (says a satirical writer) how can any person be so fanatical, and stupid as not to see that the bible is a pro-slavery book!

A SHORT CATECHISM,

ADAPTED TO ALL PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

1. Why is American slaveholding in all cases not sinful?

Because its victims are *black*.

2. Why is gradual emancipation right?

Because the slaves are *black*.

3. Why is immediate emancipation wrong and dangerous?

Because the slaves are *black*.

4. Why ought one-sixth portion of the American population be exiled from their native soil?

Because they are *black*.

5. Why would the slaves, if emancipated, out the throats of their masters?

Because they are *black*.

6. Why are our slaves not fit for freedom?

Because they are *black*.

7. Why are American slaveholders not thieves, tyrants, and men-stealers?

Because their victims are *black*.

8. Why does the Bible justify American slavery?

Because its victims are *black*.

9. Why ought not the Priest and the Levite, "passing by on the other side," to be sternly rebuked?

Because the man who has fallen among thieves, and lies weltering in his blood, is *black*.

10. Why are abolitionists fanatics, madmen, and incendiaries?

Because those for whom they plead are *black*.

11. Why are they wrong in their principles and measures?

Because the slaves are *black*.

12. Why is all the prudence, moderation, judiciousness, philanthropy, and piety on the side of their opponents?

Because the slaves are *black*.

13. Why ought not the free discussion of slavery to be tolerated?

Because its victims are *black*.

14. Why is Lynch law, as applied to abolitionists, better than common law?

Because the slaves, whom they seek to emancipate are *black*.

15. Why are the slaves contented and happy ?
Because they are *black*.

16. Why don't they want to be free ?
Because they are *black*.

17. Why are they not created in the image of God ?

Because their skin is *black*.

18. Why are they not cruelly treated, but enjoy unusual comforts and privileges ?

Because they are *black*.

19. Why are they not our brethren and countrymen ?

Because they are *black*.

20. Why is it unconstitutional to pity and defend them ?

Because they are *black*.

21. Why is it a violation of the national compact to rebuke their masters ?

Because they are *black*.

22. Why will they be lazy, improvident, and worthless, if set free ?

Because their skin is *black*.

23. Why will the whites wish to amalgamate with them in a state of freedom ?

Because they are *black*.

24. Why must the Union be dissolved, should congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia ?

Because the slaves in that District are *black*.

25. Why are abolitionists justly treated as outlaws in one half of the Union ?

Because those whose cause they espouse are *black*.

26. Why is slavery the "corner stone of our republican edifice?"

Because its victims are *black*.

We have thus given twenty-six replies to those who assail our principles and measures—that is, one reply, unanswerable and all-comprehensive, to all the cavils, complaints, criticisms, objections, and difficulties which swarm in each state in the Union, against our holy enterprise. The victims are **BLACK!** "That alters the case!" There is not an individual in all this country, who is not conscious before God, that if the slaves at the South should be to-day miraculously transformed into men of white complexions, to-morrow the abolitionists would be recognised and cheered as the best friends of their race; their principles would be eulogised as sound and incontrovertible, and their measures as rational and indispensable. Then, indeed, immediate emancipation would be the right of the slaves, and the duty of the masters! **IS IT NOT SO?**

Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society,
Office, 143 Nassau street, New York.

PREJUDICE AGAINST COLOR.

THERE are some people who consider the degraded and demoralized condition of many of our free colored population an argument against emancipation. But it should be considered that this condition has not resulted from their enjoying equal human rights. On the contrary, it has resulted from their being deprived of such rights by a general cruel prejudice against their persons, which has tended to keep them ignorant and degraded, and thus provoked them to do evil, instead of inclining them to do well. The present existing prejudice against the colored race, so peculiar to this nation, has resulted from a vitiated education, and not from a principle of instinct, as some have professed to believe.

“Nothing strikes like a fact.” The positions above laid down can be supported by undeniable facts. We appeal, then, to **FACTS**. But before we proceed to do this, we wish it to be understood, that we deny that the free colored people, in general, among us, are as degraded as is commonly supposed. If any one believes otherwise, we refer him to the legislative examination in Pennsylvania, the reports of temperance societies, &c. &c., in proof of what we assert. Still, we admit that the real or supposed condi-

tion of this class is among the most formidable obstacles to general emancipation.

Whether imaginary or real, this condition is the result of *prejudice against color*, which either prevents the moral education of the proscribed class, or else refuses to *recognize* moral worth where it actually exists. Who cannot see that, in either case or in both, such a prejudice must be highly criminal and offensive to God? The scenes of Canterbury, New Haven and Canaan, are sufficient to show that this prejudice is at war with the gracious purposes of God and the precepts of the gospel, which predict and require the intellectual and moral elevation of the whole human race.

To say that such a prejudice is the result of "a principle of instinct" implanted by the Creator, involves the blasphemy of asserting that he has implanted instincts in our bosoms which impel us to wage war upon his promised millennium, and to disobey his command to assist in hastening its progress. The supposition is likewise refuted by the fact, that this prejudice is wholly acquired, and, like other artificial states of feeling, is capable of being increased. But to our facts.

"I have myself," says a modern writer,* "travelled in Holland, for several days in succession, on board stages and canal boats, in company with a colored family from Surinam, and at all

* William Goodell.

the hotels, at Sands, at Alkmaer, the Helder, at Sardam and at Amsterdam, as well as in the public conveyances, they were treated with as much attention and politeness as any other ladies and gentlemen. Why should they not have been? They were as well-bred, as intelligent, as refined, as well clad and as wealthy, as any of their fellow travellers. The finger of scorn would have been pointed at any American, as to an unmannerly brute, unfit for decent society, who should have been guilty of any rudeness or incivility towards them. A few days afterwards, being invited to dine with one of the first merchants of Amsterdam, (and I may say of Europe,) the gentleman to whom our ship and cargo were consigned—whom should I meet, with his wife and daughters, in his drawing-room and at his table, but some of these same colored gentlemen and ladies from Surinam! I afterwards recognized them at church and on the public promenades, in company with the very *elite* of that splendid city. Yet the Hollanders are somewhat whiter than the Americans! What I saw among them, may be seen every day in all parts of Europe—at London, at Edinburgh, at Vienna, at St. Petersburg, at Paris. Americans who have visited Lafayette, at La Grange, relate just such incidents as have now been described. Does this look as though the American prejudice against colored persons was an ‘instinct’ of our natures? No. It is the very spirit

of Cain ; the spirit of the heathen, whom Paul describes as 'hateful and hating one another ;' the same spirit that, this moment, prompts the Chinese to look down upon the European nations as barbarians ; the same spirit that once led the proud Jews to shun the polluting touch of the Samaritans ; the same spirit that now, in turn, crushes down the degraded Jew through all the cities of Europe which throw open their doors to the colored man ! the same spirit that erects against the gospel the deadening influence of caste in heathen India. And yet, it holds the *bad* pre-eminence of being the only instance in which man despises his brother on account of the color his Maker gave him !

“ But let us take our stand in India, for a few moments, to contemplate this prejudice. Accompany me to Prince of Wales' Island, in the straits of Malacca, more commonly known by its original Malayan name of *Pulo Penang*. Here, under the English flag, there have been collected together, in a few years, a representation from all the principal nations of Europe and Asia. In one little town of twelve or fifteen thousand inhabitants they are congregated together. More than fifty different languages are spoken every day in the market house ; the laws are printed in more than forty ; the superintendent of the police is able to understand more or less of about twenty of them. Penang is a little world in miniature. The Chinese pagoda, the Hindoo

temple, the Mahometan mosque, the Catholic cathedral, the Protestant church, are all seen at one view. The buildings display the varied architecture of these different nations—from the thatched hut of the semi-barbarous Malay to the palace of the English governor. And, swarming in its busy and crowded streets, are seen the various costumes of the East and West, with almost all the known varieties of the human form, complexion and features, from the equator to the poles. Here stands the Russian, and near him the pallid Dane, he of the flaxen hair and light blue eye, by the side of whom, the haughty Carolinian, of sallow hue, might almost be mistaken for one of his own yellow slaves. The florid Hollander is there, the ruddy Englishman, the darker Frenchman, the swarthy Portuguese, the still darker Spaniard, proud of his descent from the African Moor, (who first taught him and Europe the use of the so-called Arabic figures.) The Moor himself is there, and still bears close resemblance to his Spanish cousin. The Turk is there, the Persian next, and next the princely Arab, the most majestic of men, with his piercing eye and his flowing beard, the descendant and representative of Abraham—and yet the Arab is a colored man! The Chinese, too, is there, the delicate-skinned native of Nankin, and the tawny emigrant from the more southern provinces. The Jew of Amsterdam is there, as *white* as the proper Hollander who des-

pises him—and he takes cordially by the hand the *black Jew* of Coromandel, who also is there, descended, as we all know, from the same parent stock, yet lacking little, save the woolly hair, to prevent his being classed with the Ethiop. The Hindoo, too, is there, the Chooliah, the Malay, and the dark Lascar, whose long, flowing hair, of glossy jet, prevents you from deciding him a negro. The African is there.

“Stand here with me, skeptical philosopher, one moment, in *Pulo Penang*, and tell me how many separate and distinct races of men, thy wisdom will please to write down? Where wilt thou draw the demarcation line between the white and the colored man? The gradation is perfect—the chain unbroken. Between the Dane and the African there is no chasm!—What sayest thou? Art thou become dumb? Hath not ‘God made of one blood all nations,’ as he says he did? Or wilt thou correct the error of Moses, and give us a new edition of thy Maker’s workmanship?

“And stand with me—Christian of America, one moment, at *Pulo Penang*. Thou who dost in *words* acknowledge thy brotherhood with all men, but in *works*, dost deny it! Open thine eyes upon this little world in miniature. Remember it is but a specimen of the myriads of mankind, in all nations and ages. It may well remind thee of that vast assembly which will one day be collected, of all kindreds, and tongues,

and nations. Open now the book of the divine law. How readest thou? Does it say, 'Thou shalt love thy' *white* 'neighbor as thyself?' How? Will you send your eye over those vast continents, to search out the little corner of the world where the sixth part of the human family resides? Those whose faces, (according to the learned philosophy of the East,) have been bleached by the *white rains* [snows] of the north, to such deathly paleness? Will you look your Maker in the face and tell him you find a natural 'instinct' in your bosom, which He has implanted there—and which forbids you to love any of his equal children, except the *white* man?

"So much for the *geography* of the question. Now for a little scrap of *history*. The negro, you say, is of a degraded race. But who are *you*? An American; a descendant of the Europeans. And the Europeans—who are *they*? *Who*? The noble ones of the earth—the men of literature—of civilization—of science—and of true religion. And whence, pray, did they derive their literature, their civilization and their religion? Europeans were hordes of naked barbarians, you know, a few centuries since! Yes; but they drew wisdom from the Greeks, the Romans, the Hebrews; and they are drawing fresh lessons still. See those ponderous volumes of classic and sacred literature. But whence, I pray you, did the Greeks, the Romans, the Hebrews, derive their civilization and their letters?

The Greeks and Romans were once savages. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were plain men, dwelling in tents. No record is made of their literature. When God determined to make of them a great nation, in what school of learning did he train up their appointed legislator, deliverer and guide? '*Moses* was learned in all the wisdom and knowledge of the *Egyptians*!' To whom did the Greeks and Romans look up, for instruction in letters, in the arts? To the *Egyptians*! Where did wealthy citizens of Rome and Athens, in their prouder days, send off their princely sons for education, as some among us now send their sons to the universities of Europe? They sent them to *Egypt*—to *Ethiopia*! But who were the Egyptians and Ethiopians? *Negroes*! Yes, negroes; with woolly hair, flat noses and jetty skins; for thus they are described by Herodotus, the prince of historians, who journeyed among them. The statue of the Sphynx, one of the seven wonders of the world, surviving the wreck of centuries, exhibits these same features at the present day. In what page of ancient literature, I pray you, is it written that the Africans were accounted an inferior race? *Inferior*, did I say? The Romans were wont to mention 'the most excellent Ethiopians.' The Greeks imagined their deities resided among them. Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, was supposed to have been an African princess. Atlas, whose shoulders sustained the

world, and even the great Jupiter Ammon himself, were located by the mythologists in Africa. These fables teach us who were then accounted the nobles of the human race.

“ But all at once, within two or three hundred years, since the *enslavement* of the African race on the American islands and continent, the wonderful discovery is made—and a discovery, too, *confined wholly* to countries where the negro has been enslaved—the discovery is made that the Ethiopians, the tutors of the whole civilized world, are become an inferior race ! A pale-faced young sophomore, in college, will feel his dignity insulted, if you ask him to recite in the same class with a pious and intelligent young colored man. Why ! He belongs to an inferior and degraded race. But—what book do you hold in your hands, young man ! ‘ Euclid’s Elements, sir’—is the answer ; and the air and the tone inform you of his conscious pride of intellect, in having been able to master and appropriate its precious contents. But who was Euclid ? Who !—the Father of mathematical science—a *negro*, who flourished some three thousand years ago ! And some of our learned Doctors of Divinity, chin deep in the huge volumes of theologic lore, transmitted down from the early fathers of the Christian church, will write grave treatises to prove that the curse of Canaan is righteously visited by atheistic hands upon the negroes—the posterity of Ham !

—that not even the gospel light can ever elevate the negro in this country; that he is of a degraded caste, and must remain such. The gospel must be preached to the negro, if preached at all, in some remote corner, by himself. The ordinances of religion, if administered to him at all, must be administered in such a way as to tell every one, that he is *not* received ‘as a brother beloved.’ And yet, the same learned man will swell with more than usual dignity of conscious knowledge, when, in his polemic and theological strife, he can quote on his own side of a contested question, the arguments, or even the opinion of a Cyprian, a Cyril, or a St. Augustine. And tell me, venerable Father, who are these? Cyprian, Cyril and Augustine, were pious and learned Christian Bishops and Theologians, Fathers of the Christian church, many centuries ago; and they were *negroes*! Does this learned disciple expect to sit down with them in heaven? And will he continue to speak of their countrymen as being of a degraded caste?

“It is vain, then, to talk of this prejudice as the result of a ‘principle of natural instinct.’ It is equally vain to talk of the abolition of slavery in America, without the abolition of this prejudice. The south points to the colored people of the north trodden down under the iron hoof of this *prejudice*, more grievously than they are in the south, and asks us if we would have slavery abolished while this *prejudice* remains;

She tells us, and speaks truly, that while the free colored man of the *south* is free to pursue any mechanical trade, is patronized according to his merit, and is neither spurned from the steamboat or the stage—he is driven like a reptile from among men at the *north*, and not suffered to find a resting-place for his foot. When the north rebukes the south for its *slavery*, the south retorts upon the north for its antipathy and *prejudice*. The newspapers of Maryland and Virginia cried out against the barbarians of Canterbury and of Canaan. They declared that such schools for *free* colored people, were laudable and praiseworthy, and would have excited no such malignity at the south. I do not believe that God can consistently crown our efforts for emancipation with success, till we first pull out the beam that is in our own eye. The very quintessence of slavery is embodied in this prejudice. It is the keenest edge of the iron that enters into the colored man's soul. It is that portion of slavery which offers the highest affront to the common Father of all men. It is the main pillar of the slave system. If two millions and a half of our *white* brethren were enslaved, the entire north would become abolitionists in one day; and the result would be the same, if the unholy prejudice were removed, which prompts us to seat our poor brother in a low place, not because of his 'vile raiment,' [see James 1. 3.] but because of the color his Maker

has seen fit to give him.—And for myself, I would sooner take the ground of the skeptic, and deny the oneness of the human family and the obligation of impartial love to all men, than to admit the divine mission of Moses, and yet treat men as though I considered it a fiction !”

Extract from a speech of the HON. ALEXANDER H. EVERETT, before the Mass. Col. Society, Feb. 7, 1838.

SIR—We are sometimes told that all these efforts will be unavailing—that the African is a degraded member of the human family—that a man with a dark skin and curled hair, is necessarily, as such, incapable of improvement and civilization, and condemned by the vice of his physical conformation, to vegetate for ever in a state of hopeless barbarism. Mr. President, I reject, with contempt and indignation, this miserable heresy. In replying to it, the friends of truth and humanity have not hitherto done justice to the argument. In order to prove that the blacks were capable of intellectual efforts, they have painfully collected a few imperfect specimens of what some of them have done in this way, even in the degraded condition which they occupy at present in Christendom. Sir, this is not the way to treat the subject. Go

back to an earlier period in the history of our race. See what the blacks were and what they did three thousand years ago, in the period of their greatness and glory, when they occupied the fore front in the march of civilization—when they constituted in fact the whole civilized world of their time. Trace this very civilization, of which we are so proud, to its origin, and see where you will find it. We received it from our European ancestors: they had it from the Greeks and Romans, and the Jews. But, Sir, where did the Greeks, and the Romans, and the Jews, get it? They derived it from Ethiopia and Egypt—in one word, from Africa. Moses, we are told, was instructed in all the learning of the Egyptians. The founders of the principal Grecian cities, such as Athens, Thebes and Delphi, came from Egypt; and for centuries afterwards, their descendants returned to that country, as the source and centre of civilization. There it was that the generous and stirring spirits of the time—Herodotus, Homer, Plato, Pythagoras, and the rest, made their noble voyages of intellectual and moral discovery, as ours now make them in England, France, Germany and Italy. Sir, the Egyptians were the masters of the Greeks and the Jews, and consequently of all the modern nations, in civilization, and they had carried it very nearly as far—in some respects, perhaps, a good deal farther than any subsequent people. The ruins

of the Egyptian temples laugh to scorn the architectural monuments of any other part of the world. They will be what they are now, the delight and admiration of travellers from all quarters, when the grass is growing on the sites of St. Peter's and St. Paul's—the present pride of Rome and London.

Well, Sir, who were the Egyptians? They were Africans :—and of what race? It is sometimes pretended, that though Africans, and of Ethiopian extraction, they were not black. But what says the father of history, who had travelled among them, and knew their appearance, as well as we know that of our neighbors in Canada? Sir, Herodotus tells you that the Egyptians were blacks, with curled hair. Some writers have undertaken to dispute his authority, but I cannot bring myself to believe that the father of history did not know black from white. It seems, therefore, that for this very civilization of which we are so proud, and which is the only ground of our present claim of superiority, we are indebted to the ancestors of these very blacks, whom we are pleased to consider as naturally incapable of civilization.

So much for the supposed inferiority of the colored race, and their incapacity to make any progress in civilization and improvement. And it is worth while, Mr. President, to remark, that the prejudice which is commonly entertained in this country, but which does not exist to any

thing like the same extent in Europe, against the color of the blacks, seems to have grown out of the unnatural position which they occupy among us. At the period to which I have just alluded, when the blacks took precedence of the whites in civilization, science and political power, no such prejudice appears to have existed. The early Greek writers speak of the Ethiopians and Egyptians as a superior variety of the species :—superior, not merely in intellectual and moral qualities, but, what may seem to be much more remarkable, in outward appearance. The Ethiopians, says Herodotus, excel all other nations in longevity, stature and personal beauty. The black prince, Memnon, who served among the Trojan auxiliaries at the siege of Troy, (probably an Egyptian prince,) is constantly spoken of by the Greek and Latin writers. as a person of extraordinary beauty, and is qualified as the son of Aurora, or the morning. There are, in short, no traces of any prejudice whatever against the color of the blacks, like that which has grown up in modern times, and which is obviously the result of the relative condition of the two races. This prejudice forms at present, as was correctly observed by President Madison in one of his speeches in the late Virginia Convention, the chief obstacle to the practical improvement of that portion of them who reside in this country.

Archbishop Sharp.

THE grandfather of Granville Sharp, in a sermon preached before the British House of Commons, one hundred and fifty-six years ago, used the following remarkable language :

“ That Africa, which is not now more fruitful in monsters, than it was once for excellently wise and learned men—that Africa, which formerly afforded us our *Clemens*, our *Origen*, our *Tertullian*, our *Cyprian*, our *Augustin*, and many other extraordinary lights in the Church of God—that famous Africa, in whose soil Christianity did thrive so prodigiously, and could boast of so many flourishing churches—alas ! is now a wilderness. ‘ The wild boars have broken into the vineyard and ate it up, and it brings forth nothing but briars and thorns,’ to use the words of the prophet. And who knows but God may suddenly make this church and nation, this our England, which, *Jeshurun*-like, is waxed fat and grown proud, and has kicked against God, *such another example of vengeance of this kind.*”

NORTHERN DEALERS IN SLAVES.*

When we entered upon the work of procuring freedom for two and a half millions of American slaves, it was in circumstances that called for a measure of the feeling expressed by one of old, who declared that he "conferred not with flesh and blood," and who could say, with reference to the solicitations of anxious friends as well as the threats of open enemies, "none of these things move me." We knew it would be a costly undertaking, and were prepared to go forward, cost what it might, of earthly good, knowing that it was a work secure of obtaining the favor of God.

We knew that the developement of the various connections with which slavery had fortified itself at the North, would produce excitement; and that the sword of truth could not reach the heart of slavery without

* This appeared as an editorial article in the *Emancipator* of January 10, 1839. The *Boston Courier*, which has re-published it, calls it "an article respecting Northern Dealers in Slaves, which must turn the hair of the persons at whom it is aimed to wool, and change the hue of their skin to crimson, if not to ebony."

striking through many individuals, for whom respectable connections and high reputation both in church and state, would plead that they might be spared the pain and disgrace of exposure. But being satisfied that the great cause of humanity requires the sacrifice, we are impelled by a sense of duty, to lay open the entanglements in which our northern men are bound hand and foot, and tongue, as the vassals of slavery. And we wish it always to be borne in mind, that these disclosures are not made for the sake of wounding individuals, but to show the tendency of the system, and awaken our whole community to a conviction of the necessity of a united and effective movement to destroy the system itself, whose evil fruits are so various and so debasing. With this view, we call attention to the following business advertisement which came to us lately in the columns of one of our southern exchange papers:—

From the Alabama Beacon, Dec. 13.

“PUBLIC SALE OF NEGROES.

“**B**Y Virtue of a deed of Trust made to me by Charles Whelan, for the benefit of J. W. & R. Leavitt, and of Lewis B. Brown, all of the city of New-York, which deed is on Record in Greene county, I shall sell at *Public Auction*, for cash, on the main street in the town of Greensborough, on Sat-

urday the 22d day of December next, a negro woman about thirty years old, and her child about eleven months old; a negro girl about ten years old, and a negro girl about eight years old.

WILLIAM TRAPP, Trustee.

" November 27, 1838. 176 3t."

Here is an assignment, made by Whelan, the slaveholding debtor in Alabama, of certain slaves, to the Leavitts and L. B. Brown, the merchant creditors in New-York, to be sold by them in default of payment of the debt due; and this assignment legally accepted by the creditors, and the sale ordered by them for their benefit.* The intervention of Trapp as trustee is a mere matter of form, for convenience.

This case, therefore, differs somewhat from those cases in which a northern merchant sends his demand to a southern lawyer for collection, and the sheriff takes the human property of the debtor in execution, and sells it according to law. Although, in the latter case, we see not how the northern man can

* It is understood the gentlemen freely admit that the arrangement was made the preceding year, by a Meeting agent sent out from this city, whose doings were approved by the principals, and the sale made under their direction; and that the transaction is justified by them, on pleas here pointed out.

exonerate himself from the crime of selling his brother; because he who does an act through another, does it himself, morally. And no man can properly send a demand to be collected in a slaveholding state, without giving positive orders to his agent or attorney, that slaves shall not be taken for payment, either by conveyance, trust, or execution. But in this case, the deed of trust is legally supposed to have been *accepted* by the creditors, for whose benefit it was made; and so the sale was necessarily made under their orders, given either by themselves or their *authorized* agent. The trustee, having no interest, could neither sell nor refuse to sell, but at the direction of the principals. It was, therefore, both in a legal and moral intent, a sale of slaves, on the 22d of December, 1838, by "J. W. & R. Leavitt and Lewis B. Brown, all of the city of New-York." As such, let us look at it a few moments, and endeavor to read its lessons.

Of one of the gentlemen named we know nothing personally. The others constitute one of the longest established firms in Pearl street, and may be properly referred to as a fair sample of New York merchants. And this is their mode of doing business. This is the course of the "southern trade," which has occasioned so much anxiety to secure it from the shocks of abolition. What these

gentlemen have not scrupled to do, and *to advertise in the newspapers*, probably the great body of New-York merchants would do just as readily and as openly. It is "the way business is done," it is "the course of trade," it is the process of "collecting southern debts," it is what our brothers and sons and neighbors do when they go to the South on "a collecting tour," it is the gathering in of the profits, the preparation for a full "account of stock" at the close of the year. It shows what we at the North have to do with slavery, and why we need to preach anti-slavery at the North. The moral sense of the whole nation is drugged to stupor by slavery. The body of New-York merchants would not send out agents to buy and sell women and children on the coast of Africa, but they do it in Alabama, without scruple or remorse, and put it in the newspapers too.

The gentlemen referred to are professing Christians, have a fair standing in the church, and bear a conspicuous part in supporting most of what are called "the great benevolent schemes of the day." Nor is it likely that they will lose either by this transaction, but will take their places at the communion table, and put the money into the contribution box which they received from this their "public sale of negroes" in Alabama, and meet in the boards and committees to which

they belong, to consult for the spread of the gospel, the reformation of mankind, and the conversion of the world, the same as before; all showing that they have only done as their neighbors would have done in like circumstances; or, in other words, that the general sentiment of the Christian community in this city countenances the selling of women and children in Alabama, by any whose interest requires it. It is this horribly depraved sentiment we have to reform; and it is for this end and not to wound or injure individuals, that we feel constrained by imperious duty to comment on the acts of individuals, as illustrative of the effects of a system.

But we must carry our remarks one step farther. Here we see a "WOMAN about thirty years old," to be sold at public auction, "for cash;" and of course she became the property of the highest bidder, whoever he might be and whatever his design or object in the purchase. The "cash" governs all and covers all. But this "woman" is also a mother, and "HER CHILD about eleven months old," is also on sale, and must go to the best bidder "for cash," whether the same that purchases the mother or not. Now, who gave Messrs. J. W. & R. Leavitt and L. B. Brown the right to take from this mother the child she bore with the pain of her own body, and sell it to a stranger "for cash?" There

is also a little "girl about ten years old," and another little "girl about eight years old," most likely the children of the same hapless parent, although the advertisement does not say so, for in the vocabulary of slavery, the ties of nature are of little account. In ancient times it was set down as one of the deepest crimes of a depraved people that they "*sold* the righteous for silver, and the *poor* for a pair of shoes," and "*sold a girl* for wine that they might drink." Yet our American Christians do much the same thing in effect; they sell women and children "for cash," and "*sold a girl*," and perhaps gave the money to the temperance society.

Let us bring this matter a little nearer home. The above-mentioned sale took place "on Saturday, the 22d day of December,"—Forefathers' Day! Did our common ancestor, who lived in Plymouth colony, though not on Plymouth rock, expect this to be the course of his descendants? One of the gentlemen, at least, is a husband and a father. And as this sale was effected "for cash" just before the holidays, we will imagine the avails of this "business transaction" just received, and specifically appropriated for the purchase of the customary new-year's presents in the family of a wealthy merchant. Let us then suppose the first glow of excitement over, the morning calls passed, the

admiration of numerous friends all duly paid, and the family circle at length quietly gathered by themselves in the ample parlor, to enjoy the domestic part of new-year's day. As the lady of the mansion looks around upon the new and costly embellishments which grace the room, she cannot suppress her admiration of the taste and kindness displayed in the purchase. "These are elegant articles, my dear husband, which you purchased with your Alabama money; in the present scarcity of money, you would not have felt able to spare so much but for that fortunate sale of the 'negro woman' and her children. How pleasant it is to us to have all our children together this evening, around our own happy fireside. I have thought several times to-day, of the slave woman who was sold, and her children taken from her, never to see her again, but I hope they have all found kind masters. Don't you suppose, my dear, that the stories told by the abolitionists are all false? You know our minister has been at the South, and was once a slaveholder himself, and must therefore know what slavery is; and he tells us that the slaves are a great deal better off than free people, and are the happiest creatures in the world. I do not see how a mother can be happy to have her children sold away. and especially the little babe of eleven months old, but they

must be used to it, you know. Well, after all, I am glad we do not have slaves here, for it does not seem quite right."

And then a little daughter takes up the story: "I thank you, dear papa, for this pretty doll you gave me to-day. Is she not a beauty? Such cherry cheeks and flowing locks, she does not look like that little black baby you sold in Alabama, does she? Papa, do little black children cry any, when they sell them and take them away from their mothers? Or, are they so used to it that they don't mind it at all? You would not let them sell *me*, would you, papa, for I am not black."

Let the young ladies now be seated at their music, and as the new instruments which were sent home last night give forth their exquisite tones, one says, "My dear father, you are very kind in providing us this elegant guitar and piano forte. But if you had not sold those two girls so well, you would have given us only common, low-priced things, such as every body uses. And now what shall we play to please our kind father? Shall we sing the Negro's Lament? It is very touching indeed. If it were any thing more than a song, I should almost think it was the words of that negro woman, talking to you, because you sold her two daughters. But you don't suppose negro women feel any thing of this, do you, father? I am sure I could never

take any pleasure in sitting by this elegant instrument, if I thought they had feelings, about being sold and separated. But I know my kind father would not sell them if it hurt their feelings."*

We will not finish the story, but leave every father, every mother, every daughter, who reads these lines, to place themselves in the stead of this mother and her daughters, from the time they were sold, "on Saturday, the 22d day of December," at public auction,

* As some of our readers may not be familiar with this song, we publish the first two stanzas "with variations."

" Forc'd from home and all its pleasures,
 [Greensb'ro's] coast I left forlorn ;
 To increase a stranger's treasures,
 O'er the raging billows borne.
 Men from [Pearl-street] bought and sold me,
 Paid my price in paltry gold ;
 But though slave they have enroll'd me,
 Minds are never to be sold. "
 Still in thought as free as ever
 What are [Merchants'] rights I ask,
 Me from my delights to sever,
 Me to torture, me to task ?
 Fleecy locks and black complexion
 Cannot forfeit Nature's claim ;
 Skins may differ, but affection
 Dwells in White and Black the same."

"for cash," on account of three citizens of New-York; and then, by a simple application of the Golden Rule, determine at once, whether it is right for northern Christian merchants to make their gains and collect their profits by such proceedings as this.

We append to the history of this mother and her "stolen daughters," a touching piece from Whittier, which has not yet been set to music, and perhaps will not be, until the wealth which now patronises the fine arts among us shall be drawn from purer sources.

THE FAREWELL OF A VIRGINIA SLAVE

To her daughters sold into southern bondage.

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 Where the slave-whip ceaseless swings,
 Where the noisome insect stings,
 Where the Fever Demon strews
 Poison with the falling dews,
 Where the sickly sunbeams glare
 Through the hot and misty air,—
 Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 From Virginia's hills and waters,—
 Woe is me, my stolen daughters!

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,

There no mother's eye is near them,
There no mother's ear can hear them ;
Never, when the torturing lash
Seams their back with many a gash,
Shall a mother's kindness bless them,
Or a mother's arms caress them.

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
To the rice-swamp dank lone,
From Virginia's hills and waters,—
Woe is me, my stolen daughters !

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
Oh, when weary, sad, and slow,
From the fields at night they go,
Faint with toil, and rack'd with pain,
To their cheer-less homes again—
There no brother's voices shall greet them :
There no father's welcome meet them,

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
From Virginia's hills and waters,—
Woe is me, my stolen daughters !

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
From the tree whose shadow lay
On their childhood's place of play—
From the cool spring where they drank—
Rock and hill and rivulet bank—
From the solemn house of prayer,
And the holy counsels there—

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 From Virginia's hills and waters,—
 Woe is me, my stolen daughters !

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 Toiling through the weary day,
 And at night the Spoiler's prey,
 Oh, that they had earlier died,
 Sleeping calmly, side by side,
 Where the tyrant's power is o'er,
 And the fetters gail no more !

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 From Virginia's hills and waters,—
 Woe is me, my stolen daughters !

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone.
 By the holy love he beareth—
 By the bruised reed he spareth—
 Oh, may He, to whom alone
 All their cruel wrongs are known,
 Still their hope and refuge prove,
 With a more than mother's love.

Gone, gone—sold and gone,
 To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
 From Virginia's hills and waters,—
 Woe is me, my stolen daughters !

In giving this article the form of a tract, it is not the intention of the Committee to single out the individuals named in it, as worse than others, but to present them as a sample of their class, to show how extensively our commercial community, and even our churches, are bound to the interests and steeped in the guilt of SLAVERY. We have no means of ascertaining the extent to which this traffic is carried, in the way of mortgages and assignments; but we have reason to believe it is very great.

The method by levying on slaves in execution for the benefit of northern creditors is doubtless still more common, and still more remorseless in its cruelty. As a sample of its operation, we find in the Alabama Beacon, of July 26, 1838, an advertisement of the United States Marshall for the Southern District of Alabama, for a large sale of slaves to be made at the court-house in Erie, Greene county, on the first Monday in August, then next, on execution, by virtue of sundry writs of *f. fa.* issued by the Circuit Court of the United States. Among them were several sales on "northern account." The following are for merchants and bankers in the city of New York.

"One negro man named Abraham, one Starling, one negro woman Maria and child, levied on as the property of David Fluke, to satisfy an ex' on in favor of H. & D. Parrish.

" One negro man named Isaac, one Frank, one Henry, one John, one Lewis, one boy named Elick, one girl named Jane, one Eliza, levied, &c. in favor of Thom. W. Lyon & Co.

" One negro man named Sam, one named Davy, one Peter, one John, one Harry, one James, one Phill, and one woman named Abby, &c. favor of J. & C. Gascoigne.

" One negro named Rant, one Paul, one Dublin, one Isham, one Bill, one Ben, one Richard, onewoman named Willy, one Fanny, one Rose, one Emeline, one girl named Willy, levied, in favor of Sam. St. John, Jr.

" One negro man named Peter, and one Tom, levied onas the property of E. F. Lyon, to satisfy anexecution in favor of J. D. Beers.

" One negro man named Tom, one Jim or Albert, one Frank, and one boy named Tom, one negro woman named Lindy, one Polly and child, one Caroline and two children, levied, &c. in favor of William E. Johnson."

At Mesopotamia on the 7th of August, 1838, one negro girl Lucindy, one bay horse, saddle, bridle, blanket and martingales, and a stock of goods, in favor of Warren Kimball.

It is by no means certain that Messrs. H. & D. Parrish, Thomas W. Lyon, J. & C. Gascoigne, Samuel St. John, Jr. John D. Beers, Warren Kimball, and William E. Johnson, knew that those men, women, and little girls and boys, were taken up by the

U. S. Marshall, at their instance, without any suspicion either of fault or debt of their own, or that they ever gave orders, personally, to have these innocent persons sold like cattle in order to put money into their pocket. But when they sent their demands to Alabama to be collected, yes, and when they trusted their goods to people in Alabama, **THEY KNEW** that this was the way it was very likely their debts would have to be collected. They are therefore just as much like kidnappers, as the man who allows, for gain or to save himself from loss, a mad beast to run at large in a crowded town, is like a murderer. The righteous God, in making laws for his ancient chosen people, has settled the question about intention, which has so often taxed the sophistry of modern apologists. He says, "If the ox **WERE WONT** to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he **HATH NOT KEPT HIM IN**, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and **HIS OWNER ALSO SHALL BE PUT TO DEATH.**" Surely, our men of business will find it better in the dying hour, to have kept their oxen at home, and their bills and notes and protested drafts in their own iron safes, than to send them where they will do such mischief to the innocent, as appears in these advertisements.

SLAVERY AND MISSIONS.

TO ALL CHRISTIANS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Dear Brethren,—It is your daily prayer that the GOSPEL may be preached to “every creature,” by which you mean, that its blessings may be extended to *all* mankind, white, brown and black, and as the Old Testament people used to say, “from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.” Of course you do not mean to exclude any portion of your own countrymen—certainly not the humblest and most oppressed portion. Surely you do not mean to let the poorest of the poor—the people that do not begin to own any thing of this world’s goods—and made so poor not by any neglect or improvidence or crime of their own—to the number of two or three millions, rise up against you in the judgment and say, “No man cared for our souls!” No, you enter into the Savior’s plan and care for all. You say His gospel *must* be preached to all. You are sending men to preach it even to the Burmans and

the Chinese—to the people that are sitting under the death-shadow of despotism. If potentates and pontiffs oppose, you regard them as resisting the work of God ; as usurping the authority of the king of kings. You do not feel yourselves bound by their mandates. You would resort to any lawful means of overthrowing their power to make room for the Gospel.

But what if we prove to you that the Christian-called republic of which you are a component part, forbids the Gospel to be preached to *two and a half millions* of your own native born countrymen, for the purpose of more conveniently depriving them of their *wages* ? Will you think that *you* have nothing to do with it ? Will you thank God for your own dear liberty, and your own blessed christianity, and sit down and let one sixth part of your countrymen live and die in *slavery and heathenism* ? You pray that your Savior's chariot of salvation may roll over all high roads and by-roads ; and won't you take the blocks out of the path ? In the Southern States, you will presently see, it

has come to a dead stand. Will you say it's of no use to *try* to clear out such a road—the chariot must go some other way ?

Perhaps you have been told that the slaves have the Gospel, or may have it, as freely as if they were free. It is but a year or two since the *Southern Religious Herald* told its readers that it was confident “ *that there is no race or class of men any where on the face of the earth, as favorably situated for bringing gospel truth to bear on them, as the slaves in the United States.* Any change in their civil condition would in this respect operate to their disadvantage.” And it is but a few weeks since we saw a similar statement copied from a southern religious paper into the *Philadelphia Observer*, without note or comment.

We wish to call your attention to some documents published in the *Greenville, (S. C.) Mountaineer*. They will show what prospect there is of evangelizing the slaves while they remain slaves. With all that has been done to disarm the Gospel of its terrors—the justifying of slavery by the Bible—the slaveholding ministry—the *oral* instruction—the

obsequiousness to the master—it is still terrible to slaveholders. “Intelligence and slavery,” they say, “have no affinity for each other.” They want not a glimmering of gospel light, lest by it their slaves should find their way to liberty.

The Methodist Episcopal Conference of South Carolina, it seems, had established some missions among the slaves, of the most unexceptionable sort, which were beginning to attract the attention of the poor colored population. No sooner did they so, than they began to be opposed. The Rev. William Wightman, a professor we believe in a Methodist Theological Institution, took up their defence, and, in a sermon preached at a Camp Meeting in Abbeville District, though he abjured abolition and declared that slavery was “*no moral evil*,” mortally offended the slaveholders by the freedom with which he spoke of them and their duties to the black part of his audience. A committee was raised among his hearers who replied to him through the newspapers. He rejoined through the same channel. We refer to this contro-

versy because it casually brings out the estimation in which pro-slavery preachers are held by the slaveholders themselves. Mr. Wightman, it seems, had said that he would "readily grant deference to their judgment in the case of a bet on a horse race, in selling rum, or in *negro-trading*," but he thought that in regard to the ministry and missions his own judgment was preferable. The slaveholders did not fail to take advantage of this putting of negro-trading on the "catalogue of vices." They show clearly that negro-trading is but a natural and necessary consequence of holding negroes as slaves; and thus taunt their clerical opponent:—

"The Reverend gentleman may reconcile his condemnation of "*negro-trading*," with his view that slavery is not "a moral evil," and thus place his topsy-turvy deportment in a conspicuous light. We suspect, however, if a great many poor young men, who are disposed to rise into notice, could meet an opportunity, like the Reverend gentleman himself, of feathering his nest, they would be willing to "trade" themselves for beautiful

and accomplished wives, with handsome portions of negro property in addition. A great many individuals would cheerfully dispense with "negro-trading," as done in the usual way, on such easy and accommodating terms. This kind of fortune hunting, this way of trading oneself for negroes, when accompanying a wife, no doubt the Reverend gentleman considers good, sound, practical morality. The Reverend gentleman seems to exult in telling us that there were in attendance a score or two (of negroes) belonging to his 'father-in-law,' who heard his Cokesbury Address."

Now men of whom the slave-masters can truly say what is here said, or what is equivalent to it, are the only men who can preach the gospel at all to the slaves, and we shall see in the following documents how even they are opposed.

Now, brethren, carefully read these documents, and then answer before God whether the slaves have the gospel preached to them, and whether they *can* have, till slavery itself is overturned. Ask yourselves whether you

are not responsible, to the extent of all your lawful, moral and political power, to remove this stumbling block from the gospel's way. Whether you are preparing to meet these two and a half millions of American brethren at the judgment bar. We publish the documents precisely as they stand in the Greenville Mountaineer of November 2d, 1838, *names* and all, except that the italicising is our own.

ABBEVILLE, DIST. S. C. OCT. 10, 1838.

Mr. Editor—We requested you to publish a Remonstrance which was prepared and intended for publication during the life-time of the late Rev. Mr. Turpin; but we were advised to address him privately, previous to its publication, as it might produce the desired effect without getting into a newspaper controversy. In conformity with this advice, the Rev. Mr. Turpin was privately addressed; and we understood at one time, that he had yielded to our request; but we heard just previous to his death, that he intended continuing his Missionary labors. When we heard of his death, we were then disposed to drop the publication of the Remonstrance, as we hoped the S. C. Conference, being advised of our opposition, would not impose another Missionary upon us, without our

consent or approbation. Here, in all probability, the agitation would have been settled, if it had not been for some personal, insolent, shameful and indiscreet remarks, delivered by the Rev. Wm. Wightman, on the 4th of August, at a Methodist Camp Meeting held at Cokesbury, vented at those who were opposed to the course pursued by the late Missionary among us. We are also informed in a recent communication from the Rev. Mr. Wightman, that we "interfered rudely with the private rights of citizens of the State," in causing a "violent opposition" to the Missionary dynasty. This is palpably false; for we never "interfered rudely" with those who patronised the Missionary. We present the private letter for publication which was handed to the late Rev. Mr. Turpin. We leave it to the public to determine, if the contents of the letter, or the handing it, without a single uncourteous remark, can be construed into rudeness. We admit that the Rev. Mr. Turpin knew the general opposition of the people in this section of country to the operations of Home Missions to Slaves among us, and those who patronised him likewise knew this general opposition. It seems, though, that we are not allowed the privilege to think for ourselves, but must submit to a dictation. The opposition to the late Home Mission among us, composes the great body of the people, while those who were

disposed to yield their support to it, embrace but a few citizens. We have no faith in the doctrine, let it be urged by whom it may, that a few citizens shall arbitrarily rule the interests of a large body of the people.

WILLIAM EDDINS,
JOEL SMITH,
JAMES S. POPE,
JOHN MCLENNAN,
HENRY R. WILLIAMS.

CAMBRIDGE, June 14, 1838.

The Rev. Mr. Turpin :

Sir:—The undersigned have been requested by a portion of the community to inform you that the course which you are pursuing, as missionary to the black population, is quite unpopular in this section of country. We anticipate evil consequences from the continuance of such a course. We are fully convinced that you will not be sustained in persisting in your missionary labors. We therefore hope, for the sake of peace among us, that you will immediately desist in your present occupation.

Yours respectfully,

J. C. PATTERSON,
STANMORE BROOKS,
WILLIAM EDDINS,
JAMES S. POPE.

REMONSTRANCE.

To the Rev. Mr. Turpin:

Sir:—A portion of the citizens of the districts of Abbeville and Edgefield are informed that you have been nominated a missionary by the S. C. A. Conference, to preach to the black population especially. It seems that you assemble the negroes at places which you regularly appoint, where you give them a course of exclusive and especial instruction on religious subjects; and, if invited, you attend negro quarters, where you give similar instruction and teach the Catechism; but if not invited, you ask this permission. We conceive it our duty to address the remonstrance to you, explaining the impropriety of such a course. It is somewhat strange, when abolition has been denounced with such bitter invective and unsparing language by the public press, by our statesmen in the Legislature and in Congress, by the Governors in their annual messages, and by an overwhelming majority of the people of this State, that a *home mission to slaves* should now be advocated and patronised among us, by certain individuals.

We are told that the instruction you give is oral: but if our apprehensions do not deceive us, we regard the toleration of this instruction as the foundation of the corner stone of a *system on which will be built the su-*

perstructure of abolition; we look in anticipation to the time, if home missions to slaves should be generally approved, that a stepping stone will be acquired on oral instruction, for a *higher grade of mental improvement, in order to facilitate religious instruction*. We have no security, that permission to give oral instruction will be the last favor craved. Verbal and lecturing instruction will increase a desire with the black population to learn. *We know upwards of a dozen negroes in the neighborhood of Cambridge, who now read, some of whom are members of your societies at Mount Lebanon and New Salem. Of course, when they see improvement encouraged, they will supply themselves with Bibles, hymn books and catechisms, particularly when they can be purchased for a trivial sum. The ambition of those who cannot read will be aroused to emulate those who can, and with opportunities thus at command to learn, we must infer that the progress and diffusion of knowledge will be a consequence. Open the missionary sluice, and the volume of its troubled current will swell in its gradual onward advance. We thus expect that a progressive system of improvement will be introduced, or will follow from the nature and force of circumstances, if not checked, (though they may be shrouded in sophistry and disguise) that will ultimately revolutionize our civil institutions.*

The legislature, from time to time, has passed several restricted and penal acts, with a view to bring under direct control and subjection the destiny of the black population. Parts of these acts even now *will become unavailing and obsolete, if these home missions to slaves shall meet with general encouragement* and patronage from the people of this state. The legislature should repeal such offensive and repugnant parts, if public opinion shall thus indicate its consent, as their execution can no longer be desirable. But we hope that South Carolina is yet true to her vital interests, and that she will not only resume, but enforce the power necessary to secure the prospect of internal quiet within her borders. The legislature is a representative body of the people of the whole state, and to this source of power we must look for the maintenance and protection of our common interests.

We will take another view of the subject, showing the *dangerous tendency to the peace of the white community, of permitting black congregations to assemble alone for religious purposes*. We will select two insurrectionary movements for illustration:—

The first we shall mention occurred in the city of Charleston, we think in the year 1822. The citizens manifested a disposition of the liveliest sympathy towards the black population, in allowing them the privilege to hold

prayer meetings, and to establish a church of their own, where they had separate worship. They assembled on such occasions under the pretence of devotional exercises, and concocted a plot for the massacre of the white population of the city of Charleston. Mock interments at their burying ground, with funeral ceremony, were performed, but the coffins which were interred, instead of inclosing the dead, were filled with military materials for an insurrection. The plan of attack was consummated, and every preparation made for the arrival of the appointed hour. A few days previous to the concerted time, the conspiracy was disclosed.

The second we shall bring to view, occurred in the state of Virginia, in the year 1831. This insurrection likewise originated from indulgence extended to the black population to assemble together for their separate religious devotion. The master spirit of this insurrection was Nat Turner, a Baptist preacher by profession, who had previously sustained an exemplary character, and who, with his black accomplices, seized upon a favorable opportunity, and began the work of destruction by burning the dwellings and murdering the white population; but the insurrection was early arrested.

These warnings should admonish us not to slumber in listless security, while we have such domestic institutions that require our

constant and vigilant attention. It is our duty as sentinels of the public welfare, to stand upon the watch-tower and sound the alarm when we see the dark speck of the distant cloud rising in the horizon, portending a destructive tempest. It is too late to seek shelter when the hurricane is sweeping over us. We are opposed to an intermeddling on the subject of slavery. We doubt not that you will inform us, that you are opposed to abolition, and that you are not disposed directly or indirectly to encourage the movements of the abolitionists, and that you have promised to confine your instruction to the black population on religious subjects. We reply that *your motives in giving such religious instruction to the black population may be pure, but the evils likely to arise from such home mission or missions, as we have already noticed in part, may be of such magnitude as to diminish the prospect of their beneficial results.*

The circumstance of your meetings being intended for the exclusive and especial instruction of the black population, will make *your appointments their principal places of resort. Some of the negroes will attend your meetings for religious improvement; others from idle curiosity; and a few of the more daring and intelligent with restless spirits, to impart to each other every whisper that reaches them of the progress of abolition, and the growing prospects of their liberation. Such inter-*

course will give them facilities to collect all such information afloat in the country. Negroes living upwards of thirty miles apart, have intentionally assembled at New Salem, one of your places of appointment. The privilege being granted the negroes to assemble together distantly, and the congregations principally black, will give them *opportunities to communicate freely with each other* and embody their views on the consummation of any plot. They might plan arrangements again dangerous to the peace of society. Though they have been frustrated in every insurrectionary attempt, yet they may be again deluded. They have ventured on chances gloomy and unpropitious, and we must judge of the future by the past. When the last census was taken, the *black population exceeded the white upwards of sixty-one thousand five hundred.* This is a *startling fact*, which should induce us to be cautious in the intellectual advantages which we extend to the black population. We consider the common adage true, that "knowledge is power," and as the colored man is enlightened, his condition will be rendered more unhappy and intolerable. *Intelligence and slavery have no affinity for each other.* We know that we have the power at present (if let alone) to keep the negroes in subordination; and it will be an exercise of wisdom to make a judicious use of it, for *strict discipline is mercy to them.* The point questioned

and tacitly yielded to-day, is taken as a precedent to-morrow, and invasion succeeds. The white people who have the inclination or curiosity, are permitted to attend your meetings : but at one of your first meetings at New Salem, you requested only a few of the gentlemen to attend, as you designed your instruction for the black population. A preference of seats next to the pulpit is given to the blacks. You have requested white ladies and gentlemen to retire from the front seats next the pulpit. The old negro man, whose head is white with age, has *never witnessed a preference before* ; this is a novel sight, which *must be exhilarating to his feelings*, and prompts him to raise his thoughts to look through the vista which will terminate his bondage. The intention of your meetings being known, and a preference given in the accommodation of seats, will induce the white people to relax in their attendance. Indeed, we have been told that at some of the meetings, in some sections of the State, the missionary is the only white man present on such occasions. You may be faithful in the discharge of your duties, in the responsible station you occupy toward the slaveholder ; yet you *may be succeeded in your mission by a missionary who might entertain a different opinion with you in regard to emancipation* ; and possessing your opportunities, might inculcate seditious sentiments, hazardous to our peace and interests. If he was a

hypocrite (and that good book, the Bible, informs us of the hypocrisy of men, without adverting our experience and observation in evidence) he would conceal his views of abolition from the public, but propagate them clandestinely on suitable and appropriate occasions.

We consider these negro missions in embryo, though we are informed that fourteen missionaries are now in service; but we look to the period when there will be a sufficient increase in number to penetrate every neighborhood and visit every negro quarter in the State. *If these home missions to slaves shall become thus universally popular in South Carolina, some of us may live to see the period that such an impulse will be given from such missions towards emancipation, that emancipation will follow as a matter of expediency and necessity. The negro property which the parent is now toiling to accumulate, may prove valueless to his children.*

We do not now charge the great body of the advocates of these home missions to slaves with the intention of promoting abolition; but we think that these missions, if permitted to increase, will ultimately have such a tendency. Indeed, we do not think that a *reasonable abolitionist could desire a more auspicious commencement*, from present appearances, for the promotion and attainment of his object, as he must now see the zealous anxiety so striking-

ly displayed for the interest and welfare of the black man which must have an effect, from the system of oral instruction pursued, to enlighten his mind and improve his temporal condition. *There may be abolitionists now among us, who dare not avow their principles, and who express their opinions with caution in regard to encouraging such religious instruction, but if these missions shall increase in popular repute, will become emboldened to give a more full expression of their views, and speak with more confidence of the kind treatment and privileges that should be extended to the black population.* A man can pursue any particular train of thinking or occupation until it may amount to a passion. We should think that even a missionary to the blacks, who might be opposed to abolition on beginning to discharge the duties of his mission, *might be liable, from the nature of his employment, to change his opinion, when all his thoughts, words, and actions, feelings and sympathies, are enlisted in one cause and running in one channel.* No doubt the design of these home missions to slaves was intended originally for the best of purposes; but it may be an easy transition, at some future day, for a perversion to be made of them.

We regret that it was thought necessary to plant the missionary standard in this section of country, when it was pervaded, nearly seven years ago, with considerable alarm from

the apprehension of an insurrection. From evidence satisfactorily obtained, one negro was hung, another severely flogged, and others were accused. At that time, in the neighborhood of Cambridge, there were three black preachers, one of whom had supported a good character for at least forty years, who were in the habit of preaching occasionally to black congregations, but from suspicious indications were ordered to desist from holding meetings; since which time, all such congregations have been suppressed, until the recent commencement among us of the missionary era. We cannot see any real necessity to appoint meetings in this part of the country for the exclusive and especial instruction of the black population; when churches are established in every neighborhood, and ample provision generally made in their construction to accommodate them with seats. The negroes who have been raised among us have had opportunities of attending church, and of listening to the precepts of the Gospel delivered from the pulpit from their childhood; and we do not know a single slaveholder who is in the habit of preventing his slaves from going to church on Sunday, but on the contrary, the propriety is frequently inculcated on them. It is not uncommon for the preacher on such occasions to *address a suitable portion* of his discourse to this population particularly. This instruction is then given be-

fore the usual *white audience* of the church. If any injudicious or untimely remark should escape, every white person can become a censorer. This has been a custom since our recollection. We have heard no murmuring against this course. The negroes are permitted to join the churches when their deportment is considered worthy. We prefer that old customs, which we know to be safe from experience, shall continue, and trust that the laws, which have been passed for our benefit and safety, will be faithfully executed. In order that you shall know the public opinion on this subject in this section of country, we hereunto sign our names.

James S. Pope	Wm. Mc Kineely
Pleasant Burnett, Jr.	C. H. Mathews
B. Reams	Carter Burnett
H. Morris	E. Perkison
E. Holloway	J. Reams
G. Reams	Wiley Morris
E. Attaway	J. E. Rowell
Obed Morris	Robert Burns
Wm. Rowe	D. G. Burnett
F. Ross	J. Mathews
Robert Williamson	J. Rotton
Daniel Proctor	Simeon Attaway
Hy. Riddle	W. N. Moore
G. W. Howle	John Walton
P. M. Howle	Thomas Payne
J. T. Forlens	Reuben Cooper

D. H. Jones	Freeman Martin
Pleasant Burnett,	J. A. Berry
David W. Holloway	Benjamin Stevens
Sampson Christie	Elihu Stevens
James Dorn	Richard Hasel
Drury Mathews	Joel Walton
Henry R. Williams	Morris Fowler
D. E. Davenport	Asa May
William May	Alexander Howle
William Adams	Thomas B. Harvey
A. P. King	John Presley
J. W. Wimbish	William Thompson
Amasa May	Toliver Bradfield
Marshal Thompson	James Bradfield
Elbert Stevens	James McCreles
Henry Cockroft	Wiley Culbreath
Wm. L. Rotton	R. M. Todd
Matthew Corley	Sampson Sullivan
Wm. Culbreath	Lewis Holloway
Asa Fowler	S. O. Sullivan
Azariah Rice	Abram P. Poole
Welles Mars	J. W. Cain
John May	Daniel Carter
Willis Rotton	Wm. Mathews
G. W. Holloway	John McClennan
John Mims	Patrick Heffernan
John McGower	Jonathan Norrell
Thomas H. Chappel	Madison Bailey
James H. West	Mathew Mays
William B. Smith	Felix Rogers
Wm. P. Andrews	William Lyles
John N. Sample	J. W. Boazman

J. H. Wilson	John Deen
Wm. Eddins	John Culbreath
William H. Griffin	A. T. Abney
Frederick Logan	Edward Culbreath
J. McCracken	J. M. Norrell
Wade Shuttlesworth	Richard Hagood
J. W. Child	John Dorn, Sen.
N. C. Golding	James Smyly
Joel Smith	Samuel McCrary
L. G. Carter	John S. Jones
Robert Child	J. O. Nicholson
Wm. S. Williams	S. W. Nicholson
David Wood	John S. Jeter
John Rely	C. J. Glover
James C. Ray	Wm. J. Simkins
Stanmore Brooks	J. H. Harrison
Hardy Clark	B. J. Ryan
L. J. White	Robert Lofton
T. J. Henderson	George Sheppard
Benjamin Sale	T. H. Loveless
Wm. D. Partlow	Sherry Covar
Lemuel Bell	Wm. Forrest
Richmond Still	Mastin Rowe
Mathew Mathews	Charles Carter, Sen.
C. J. Cooper	Charles Carter, Jr.
J. W. Trotter	John Carter, Jr.
Wiley Ross	Wm. C. Burns
Willis Ross	Wm. Whitley
Simpson Mathews	John Riley
James Mathews, Sen.	Swansy Wier
Wm. Andrews	Stephen Whitley
Jesse Culbreath	Wm. Butler

E. Davis	John S. Black
Joseph Foster	Jonathan Johnson
Wm. B. Arnold	Henry Johnson
Wiley Pulliam	John Forshe
D. Calhoun	Peter Cheatham
Robert Buchanan	Wm. Saddler
Joseph Wardlaw	Willis Saddler
William Carter	Aaron Pinson
Charles Hagood	Elihu Campbell
Simeon Chaney	Elihu Burges
John Day	Wesley Turner
Daniel Day	Chesley Pitts
Henry Cheatham	Thomas Turner
Wesley E. Cantrell	Thomas Brooks
Zebedee Cheatham	T. J. Dutler
Philip Weir	Daniel Brooks
Simson Harris	Leroy Day
John B. Moon	David Hardin
Robert Cheatham,	Elmsley Biel
John Waller	Samuel F. Good
Edmund Brown	James Sheppard
John Hughey	James J. Still
A. T. Logan	Jesse Rambo
Sampson V. Cain	Camei Clegg
H. W. Wardlaw	H. J. Kemp
James Jones	John B. Hamilton
Benjamin Conolly	Shurley Whatley
John Christie	Lemuel Brooks
Robert Chany	John G. Slappy
Meredith W. Payne	Joshua Davis
Wm. L. Steel	Samuel Stevens
Joshua Wyman	Robert Hasting

Ephraim Andrews	J. W. Coleman
John Dorn	John L. Cheatham
Charles C. Burnett	Joseph C. Patterson
Oliver Bradfield	Benjamin Holt
W. E. Caldwell, M.D.	Temple Hargrove
Thomas J. Burnett	John B. Rountree
Joseph N. Wardlaw	James Robertson
John W. Moore	Wilson Kemp
John Partlow, Sen.	Wiley Kemp
A. Jackson Goulden	M. P. Holloway
James Cheatham	John W. William
Wm. Adams	Thomas Wait
Goody McManus	John McClennan
William Adams	Wm. Arnold
M. Corley	James Collins
J. A. Williams	John Smith
James Holland	John Sims
Wm. Brunson	Stephen Jones, Jr.
Joel Roper	Rial Jones
J. Cogburn	James Long
A. B. Addison	Waid Sheppard
H. Burt	Charles W. Fooshe
G. H. Down	Joel Fooshe
F. M. Nicholas	R. Pulliam
Chas. A. Meigs	M. T. Stewart
H. Huffman, Sen.	Branton Owen
W. Carrel	James Hill
William Mounce	James H. Richardson
Wiley Holloway	Jno. Saddler
Moses Carter	John S. Pinson

[The remaining seventy names omitted for want of room in this tract.]

DR. NELSON'S LECTURE ON SLAVERY.

Dr. Nelson was born and educated in Tennessee. For many years he was a surgeon; but having become very deeply impressed with religion, he changed that profession for the ministry; and at length became pastor of a Presbyterian Church, in Danville, Kentucky. His labors there were much blessed; and all classes of people in that region speak of him as having been singularly beloved and respected, until he thought duty called him to become the president of Marion College, in Missouri. Here his able letters on the subject of slavery aroused jealous fears as to the College; and the arrival of two free colored youths, from New-York, one to be employed as a domestic in Dr. Nelson's family, and the other with the intention of fitting himself for a missionary to Africa, served as a breeze to the already kindling flame. Two hundred men, including lawyers, doctors, and various public characters, armed with pistols, dirks, clubs, &c. proceeded to the Mission Farms, with the avowed intention of

white young men, in whose company the colored youths had arrived; searched their trunks for what they called "incendiary papers;" threatened tar and feathers, or 150 lashes, well laid on: but finally released them, without personal violence, on condition that they left the state forthwith, and never entered it again, under penalty of death. The innocent colored youths, in the mean time, had been secretly conveyed away, and thus escaped the danger.

This outbreak was followed by fresh disturbances of a similar character; in which Dr. Nelson was threatened and distressed, but otherwise received no injury. A public meeting was called at Palmyra, in which resolutions were passed, approving of these violent proceedings, and declaring "a solemn and abiding determination" to follow them up, till fanaticism was crushed. This meeting, in May, 1836, was followed by events which greatly harassed Dr. Nelson, and many of his friends considered his life in danger. On one occasion, he was obliged to escape from his home at night to avoid the fury of Lynch law. The spirit of slavery, finally drove him from Missouri. He is now zealously engaged in building up a Mission Institute in the neighborhood of Quincy, Illinois. During a visit to New England in February, 1839, to solicit funds for this institution, Dr.

Nelson, being requested publicly to express his sentiments concerning slavery, delivered the following Lecture at Northampton, Mass.

THE LECTURE.*

Dr. Nelson commenced his remarks by stating, that the black and white races were mixing very fast in the slave States. He had been accustomed to hear young men boast so generally of profligate connexions with slaves, that when he was first told such attachments would be disgraceful in the free States, he could not believe it. The gradual lightening of complexions among the slaves was strikingly observable, even within his own recollection. He knew people, married and settled in the free States, who had once been slaves; but they were so perfectly white, that none suspected their origin. He said when he was surgeon in the army, during the last war, an officer, who messed with him, one day stepped up to the ranks, and laying his hand on a soldier, said, 'You are my slave!' The man dropped his knapsack and musket in a moment, and cooked for them during the remainder of the campaign. He was lighter than his master, who happened to have

* The sketch of this lecture was first published in the Boston Liberator, March 1, 1839. It, has been revised, and some slight addition made, by Mrs. Child.

a dark complexion. His astonished comrades would exclaim, 'Why, Julius, is it possible you are a slave? You used to be a very respectable and thriving man in Ohio!' To which the 'chattel' replied, 'And I mean to be respectable and thriving again, before I die. Honesty and industry will help a man up in the world.' When his master urged that he ought to serve him several years, in consideration of his kindness, and the money he had paid for him, Julius answered, 'Perhaps I may for a little while, master; but I can't stay long; freedom is too sweet.' Dr. N. mentioned having talked with a slave, who said he had run away in obedience to his master's orders. 'My master was always very kind to me,' said he; 'and when my mistress was first married, she was very kind; but as her children grew up, the neighbors observed they looked just like me. Then she began to dislike me, and had me punished often. But the older the children grew, the more we looked alike. At last, she said I must be sold to New Orleans. Then my master told me to tie up my clothes and run away.'

The inferences deduced from these facts were, that slavery tended to promote a rapid amalgamation, while freedom checked it; and that if the admixture of the two races went on in as rapid a ratio as it had done for

the last thirty years, it would soon be impossible for us to judge whether our citizens were slaves or not, by their complexion.

The speaker next alluded to the strong local attachments of the colored race. He had frequently met emancipated or runaway slaves, who said, 'How I do long to go back where I lived when I was a child! The climate suits me better; and more than that, all my friends and relations are there. Oh, if slavery was only abolished, so that we could all be free there, I'd be back quicker than I came.'

This was intended to show that there was no danger of colored people all flocking to the North, in case of emancipation, and leaving the South without laborers.

Dr. N. expressed surprise that he had been asked to lecture in New England, because he knew so much about slavery. "Why, my dear friends," said he, "there are things which the smallest boy in this room knows just as well, perhaps better than I can tell him. A dear sister in Christ lately asked me, if I did not think the slaves would cut their masters' throats, if they were freed at once. Said I, Dear sister, you shall answer that question yourself, if you please. Suppose you were compelled to work without wages, year after year—told when you might go to bed, and when you must get up—what you

might eat, and what you might wear—should you think it just and right? Suppose your master at last became troubled in conscience, and said, 'I restore your freedom. Forgive the wrong I have done you. Go, or stay, as you please. Your earnings are henceforth your own. If you are in trouble, come to me, and I will be your friend.' Do you think you should feel like cutting that man's throat? She eagerly replied, 'Oh, no, indeed I should not.'

"Although labor is a blessing to man, yet we all feel that a great degree of it is hard. When I plough the fields in a hot day, I feel that there is some things *hard* about it. What is it enables me to go through it with a light heart? It is the hope of receiving wages, for the comfort and improvement of myself and family. But what if I and my family are all compelled to work without wages? This would make the labor seem ten times as hard. My dear fellow travellers to eternity, these things must be just as plain to you, as they are to me.

"I lived many years without having a suspicion that there was any thing wrong in holding slaves. Even after I had an interest in Christ, there seemed to be nothing amiss in it; just as pious people went on making and selling rum, without troubling their consciences about it. Oh, that I then could have had

faithful christian brethren, to rouse me with the voice of exhortation and rebuke ! I should not then have approached the table of our Lord with fingers all dripping with the blood of souls ! I will tell you what first called my attention to this subject. My wife came to me one day, and said that Sylvia (one of our servants) had told her we had no right to hold our fellow-beings in bondage ; she had worked for us six years, and she thought she had fully paid for herself. I gave some rough answer, and turned away. A few days after, my wife again remarked that Sylvia said the holding of slaves could not be justified by the Bible. ' Don't mind her nonsense,' said I. By and bye, my wife said, ' Sylvia brings arguments from the Scriptures, which I find it hard to answer.' Well, my friends, the end of it was, that Sylvia made an abolitionist of my wife, and my wife made an abolitionist of me.

" When my feelings were thus roused on the subject, I was anxious to discover some way by which we could benefit the colored race, and best atone for the wrong we had done them. I thought I discovered this in the Colonization plan : and for seven or eight years I labored in that cause with as much zeal as I ever felt on any subject. If you ask why I did not, during this time, boldly remonstrate with others against the sin of slavery, I must answer, that, in addition to the natural

depravity of my own heart, I was prevented by the conviction that I was doing enough of my duty by working for Colonization. After a time my views began to change. I will tell you briefly how it happened. If you differ from me in the inferences I draw, I have no controversy with you, my brother. Work in your own way, I only tell you what effected a change in my own mind. I had from the very beginning been occasionally pained by remarks I heard. When I recommended the scheme to slaveholders, they entered into it warmly, and said they should be right glad to get rid of the free colored people; they were convinced such a movement would render their slave property more valuable and secure. These things pained me a little. Still I thought I might do good by laboring for Colonization; and I did labor zealously, until the discussion at the North forced upon me the knowledge that the Society has been working *sixteen years* to carry off *one fortnight's increase of slaves*! Then I was "discouraged; and my hands dropped by my side." A visit to the Cherokees gave me some thoughts concerning Colonization as a Missionary enterprise. Many of the Indians had become converts to Christ; they had improved in the arts of civilized life; and there was a light in the eye, always kindled when men begin to think about the soul and its existence in a future

life. But the difficulty was, the same country which sent them messengers of the blessed Gospel, likewise sent among them cart-loads of rum. I remembered how missionaries in Pagan lands dreaded the arrival of a ship from their own country ; because where there was one sailor that would speak to the natives of God and the Bible, there were six who would lead them into drunkenness and debauchery. Why, my dear hearers, I should be afraid to take any congregation, in the most moral town—even this audience, if you please,—and set you all down in the midst of a heathen land, as missionaries there. I should be afraid you would not all be fit for your work."

The lecturer neglected to point the moral ; but he obviously meant to ask, What then can be expected from ship-loads of ignorant and degraded slaves, landed on a Pagan shore ?

" After I emancipated all my other slaves," continued he, " I still held one man in bondage several years. He seemed to be incapable of taking care of himself. My friend said it would be wrong to emancipate him ; he was so stupid, he would suffer if he had no master to provide for him, and would soon come upon the county. He certainly did seem very stupid ; so I continued to hold him as a slave. But oh, how I bless God that a voice of warning and rebuke reached me

from the Free States! Oh! I expect to sing about it through all eternity! It led me to ask myself, are you not deceived in thinking you keep this man from motives of benevolence? Is it not the fact that you like well enough to have him to black your boots, and catch your horse? I called him to me, and said 'I give you your freedom. Whatever you earn is your own. If you get sick, or poor, come to me. My house shall always be a home to you.' About a year after, I met him riding on a pony. 'Well,' said I, 'how do you like freedom?' 'Oh, massa, the sweetest thing in all the world! I've got a hundred silver dollars stowed away in a box!' The last time I talked with him, he had laid by six hundred dollars. If you let a man have the management of his own concerns, though he is stupid, he will brighten up a little.

"When I was three or four years old, I could say off all the alphabet, and spell some small words; but it was soon discovered that I had learnt all this by rote, and did not know one of the letters by sight. I was taken from school, and one of my father's young slaves became my principal teacher. He would lead me out under a shady tree, and try to impress the letters on my mind, by saying, 'That's great O, like the horse-collar; that's H, like the garden gate, that's little g, like your father's spectacles.' He was much brighter

than I was ; but I was sent to college, and he was sent into the cornfield. He became dull ; and I dare say if I could now find him, somewhere in Alabama, I should find him stupid and ignorant. Yet if he had gone to school and college along side of me, he would have been as much superior to me, as I am now superior to him.

"I have been asked concerning the religious instruction of slaves ; and I feel safe in answering, that in general it amounts to little or nothing. Hundreds and thousands never heard of a Savior ; and of those who are familiar with his name, few have any comprehension of its meaning. I remember one gray headed negro, with whom I tried to talk concerning his immortal soul. I pointed to the hills, and told him God made them. He said he did not believe any body made the hills. I asked another slave about Jesus Christ. I found he had heard his name, but thought he was son of the Governor of Kentucky."

(Dr. Nelson was understood to say this slave was held by a Minister of the Gospel.)

"One of my pious Presbyterian brothers charged me with being too severe upon him: He said he certainly did instruct his people: he did not suffer them to grow up in heathen ignorance. While we were talking, one of his slaves entered the room ; and, having asked leave to propose some questions to him, I

said, 'Can you tell me how many Gods there are?' 'Oh, yes, massa; there are two Gods.' "

Being asked concerning the treatment of slaves, Dr. N. said, "I have not attempted to harrow your feelings with stories of cruelty. I will, however, mention one or two among the many incidents that came under my observation as family physician. I was one day dressing a blister, and the mistress of the house sent a little black girl into the kitchen to bring me some warm water. She probably mistook her message; for she returned with a bowl full of boiling water; which her mistress no sooner perceived, than she thrust her hand into it, and held it there till it was half cooked.

"I remember a young lady who played well on the piano, and was ready to weep over any fictitious tale of suffering. I was present when one of her slaves lay on the floor in a high fever, and we feared she might not recover. I saw that young lady stamp upon her with her feet; and the only remark her mother made, was, 'I am afraid Evelina is *too much* prejudiced against poor Mary.'

"My hearers, you must not form too harsh a judgment concerning individuals who give way to such bursts of passion. None of you can calculate what would be the effects on your own temper, if you were long accustomed to arbitrary power, and hourly vexed

with slovenly, lazy, and disobedient slaves. If sent on an errand, they would be sure to let the cattle into the cornfield; if they gave the horse his oats, they would be sure to leave the peck measure where it would be kicked to pieces. Such is the irritating nature of slave service.

“ I am asked whether Anti-Slavery does not tend to put back emancipation. Perhaps there is less said about it in Kentucky, than there was a few years ago; but the quietus seems to be this: in answer to my arguments, slaveholders reply. ‘ Why, Christian ministers and members of churches, at the north, say *they* do not think slavery is so entirely wrong. Now, they certainly have a better chance to form an impartial judgment than we have.’ This operates like a dose of laudanum to the conscience; but the effects are daily growing weaker. I do not know how it is, but there seems to be a class at the North, much more ready to apologize for slavery, than the majority of the slaveholders themselves.

“ Much is said about the excitement produced.—For the sake of the little boys here, I will illustrate this by an example. The Greeks were a cultivated and refined people; but it was a part of their worship of Diana to whip boys at her altar, until their sides were worn so thin, they could see their bowels;

and their parents were not permitted to weep, while they witnessed this cruel operation.—When the apostle Paul came among them, he lifted up his voice against their Pagan rites, and told them their Gods were made by the hands of men. Then they all began to scream, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!' Some good people hearing the uproar, might have said, 'See how Paul puts back the cause of Christianity! None of the other apostles will dare to come here to preach. Paul himself had to run!' Yet what was the result? The images of Diana were finally overthrown, and Christ was worshipped in her stead. Just so it will be with the slaveholders. They scream, because they feel the sharp points of truth prick their consciences; but they can't stand there and scream forever. The postmasters may try to shut out information; but it is like piling up a bar of sand across a rushing river. Let the broad stream roll on, and it will soon carry the sand before it.

"I am glad of organized abolition, because I believe that over all the din, some portion of truth even now reaches the slaveholder's conscience. Already, many have learned that every thing is safe and prosperous in the British West Indies, and that property is fast rising in value there; more will learn it soon. I hear of one acquaintance after

another, who begins to feel uneasy about holding human beings in bondage. Members of my former church in Kentucky beg me to print more letters about slavery; and when I tell them the postmaster will destroy them, they answer, 'Then seal them up in the form of letters; we are willing to pay the postage.' Already it is observable that professors of religion are afraid to *sell* their slaves. This shows that the wedge has entered. It will enter deeper yet.

"Am I asked what is the remedy for slavery?—I can only answer, that I have known very many emancipated slaves; and I have never known or heard of one instance where freedom did not make them more intelligent, industrious, and faithful to their employers. Their grateful affection for old master and mistress almost amounts to worship. They seem ready to kiss the very ground they tread on. The plan I propose is, that each and every slaveholder try this blessed experiment. But some inquire, ought they not to be compensated for their property? Sylvia said she had paid all she cost me, when she had worked for us six years; and she said truly. Now a large proportion of slaves have been held three and four times as long; and of course have paid for themselves three or four times over.

"What is the duty of christians at the

North? Dear fellow travellers to eternity, need I remind you that Jesus has said, inasmuch as we neglect the least of his brethren, we neglect him? Jesus is the Brother, as well as the Redeemer, of the human race. If you neglect the poor slave, when he lies in prison, sick, hungry, and naked, how will you answer for it at the judgment seat? Surely it is a solemn duty for christians at the North to rebuke and persuade christians at the South, with all affection, but still with all faithfulness and perseverance.

"I have stated only what I myself have seen and known, in Kentucky, Missouri, Virginia, and Tennessee. To illustrate each point, I have selected one or two instances where I might relate a thousand. If any man doubts my evidence, I think I could convince him of its truth if he would travel with me in the states where I have resided."

This is a hasty abstract of Dr. Nelson's lecture; but I believe it is correct. The audience apparently listened with a great degree of interest. These anecdotes of things personally known to the lecturer are excellent illustrations of principles, and are highly attractive. I have often wished that James G. Birney and Angelina E. Grimke made more free use of them.